THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

A WHOLLY delightful book on *Religion in America* has been written by the Rev. Willard L. SPERRY, Dean of the Divinity School, Harvard.[1] It is the first of a series on American Life and Institutions under the general editorship of the Master of St. John's College, Cambridge. This book sets a high standard. It is written with unconventional freedom. Dean SPERRY assumes the attitude of a friend and talks with us intimately, using 'you' and 'we,' and not the usual third person.

The first chapter is a text on which the Dean enlarges in the rest of the book. In this chapter he lays down four general propositions about American religion. He calls them generalizations. The first is that the greatest difference between England and America is that there is no Established Church on the other side. In England church and chapel are not the same thing, and even if disestablishment were to come to-morrow the distinction would persist in memory and usage. There are bishops in the House of Lords. The parish church in an English village in several ways represents the whole village. The Anglican Church makes a historic appeal to the whole people. But the words 'Nonconformity' and 'Dissent' are meaningless in America.

There is no politically privileged Church from which to dissent. No one can understand religion in America unless he rids his mind entirely of the idea of Establishment. And one result of this is that America has little idea of the Church in a catholic sense. They know only churches. 'America is naked of "the Church" in the historic sense of that word. The place of the Church is taken by "denominations." Lord Bryce takes this separation of Church and State as the distinguishing feature of American religious life.'

This has meant a loss, notably in the field of education. State-supported schools, colleges, and universities are prohibited from giving anything like formal religious instruction to the young. By the new Education Act in England religious education has now been made mandatory. And if this succeeds we shall have done something, says the Dean, which there is not the slightest prospect of Americans being able to do. Religion is out of bounds in American schools supported by public funds.

This secular treatment prevails nearly everywhere to-day. We have transferred from the Church to the State the task of shaping the minds and characters of youth. All over the Protestant world education is secular. Do we understand what we have done? 'This is revolution. It is the most fundamental aspect of the social transformation which has brought us from the mediæval into the modern world.' Still, the legal separation of Church and State in America must not be misconstrued. The country has never been committed to irreligion. America is a Christian country, by history, heredity, culture and dominant practice. And its religion, if not State-recognized, is pervasive.

The second characteristic of American religion is its particularism. It is individualistic, 'rankly' so, the Dean says. There is an element of truth in the statement made by the Bishop of Gloucester that, from the standpoint of church life in England, all churches in America, whatever their polity, are congregational. When the average American thinks of his church, he thinks not of a wide communion, much less of the Holy Catholic Church, but of the four walls of the building where he worships on Sunday. The idea of the church has for him an intensely 'local habitation.'

This is to be understood in terms of the American idea. The political traditions of the country have encouraged the habit of self-assertion. The doctrine of the rights of man and the traditions of single individuals who have been pioneering for three centuries have made the American people a society of religiously self-assertive individuals. Hence the multiplicity of small religious bodies, which is an almost unique feature of American religious life. 'We are badly over-populated with denominations,' says Dean SPERRY. 'This is perhaps the only land in Christendom which can spawn an Aimée McPherson and a Father Divine

[1] Cambridge University Press; 10s. 6d. net.

with wanton disregard of all the sober Christian conventions. In this respect we are made, as Saint Paul says, a public spectacle unto the world.'

The federal census of 1936 reports 256 religious denominations in the United States. The present population of the United States is 134,000,000. Of these 67,300,000 are listed as in an 'inclusive church membership.' And religion is gaining on the population. From 1930 to 1942 the population increased 9·1 per cent., while church membership increased 12·9 per cent. It may be of interest to add that of the sixty-seven millions above-mentioned twenty-three millions are Roman Catholics, four millions six hundred thousand are Jews and one million two hundred thousand are Eastern Orthodox. This leaves thirty-eight millions and a half for the rest.

The third 'generalization' about American religion is that it is optimistic. The Dean speaks of 'the immense and indomitable' optimism. This quality of the national spirit derives directly from the whole history of the country. To multitudes in Europe America has been the land of promise, attracting floods of emigrants, and there has always been the possibility that the emigré might find the pot of gold at the far end of the rainbow. Whatever may happen to the Old World it is the New World that offers the promise of great fulfilment. This is the major article in the national faith of America and has become a dogma. Mr. Dooley expressed this self-consciousness in his usual pithy manner when he said: 'We are a great people, Hennesy, and the best of it is, we know we are.'

This indomitable optimism is in strange contradiction to the theological axioms of the orthodox religions which the emigrants brought with them. These axioms described man as a fallen and sinful creature whose only hope is in the unmerited grace of God. But the average American is impatient of any mention or recognition of the more sombre aspects of human nature and human history. For three hundred years he has found no occasion to concede any disquieting facts such as traditional orthodoxy insists on, or to doubt his own complete competence to deal with any trouble that might arise. Therefore the grim truths he hears on Sunday have little relation to the cheerful self-reliance with which he goes about his business for the rest of the week.

There is, thus, an unresolved contradiction at the heart of American religion. The old sombre theological words are still said, but daily life is conducted on another assumption. This contradiction is, of course, met wherever the modern world exists, but it is most perversely present in the land where the record thus far seems to have given the lie to the ancient creeds. The authentic religion of America has been, thus far, that of the premature and provisional optimism to which youth is always liable. And it must be remembered that America has been until recently still in its adolescence.

At this point, however, a radical change is already taking place in American life. Uncritical and uncriticized optimism is no longer possible in its traditional forms. A strange and hitherto unknown sobriety has come over the national mind. What this soberness implies, as a reflection on the past and as a portent for the future, remains to be seen. Perhaps the religion of America is to be hereafter less incomplete than it has hitherto been, and thus more akin to the elder historic faiths which Christendom as a whole has professed.

Finally, Dean SPERRY suggests that there is a good deal of extra-mural religion in America. It has been assumed in what the Dean has said that the religion of America is that expressed through the churches. But there is a lurking suspicion that these churches and what goes on in them are no longer directly related to the realities of common life round about. And churches, behind their bland self-confidence, are uneasy and apprehensive. There is always the sober warning of the gospel that the Kingdom of God may be taken from ecclesiasticism and given to some other order nearer the spiritual and moral realities of things.

It is difficult to judge the present situation in nominally Christian lands. So far as America is concerned, Dean SPERRY thinks that churches, church members, and church attendance are relatively more numerous in America than in most other countries. But there is a suspicion that this may be a survival form of life rather than a transcript of contemporary facts. Is the churchgoing of America a matter of unspent momentum from the past? It is true that the ship has steerage-way, but she may be losing the breeze.

But there is something to be said on the other side. In these times there has been found good ground for a new appreciation of the churches, a new fund of goodwill towards them, because largely of the moral earnestness that has been

apparent in them. But, still, there remains the question whether conventional ecclesiasticism ever represents the living religion of a people. And the honest critic of American affairs must face the possibility that the true religion of his land is not that of Protestant, Romanist or Jew, but rather some secular idolatry such as success or the 'almighty dollar.' And, finally, any account of American life must reckon with the existence of a very large number of persons, unchurched and mildly anti-clerical who still take a sympathetic interest in the world of religious ideas.

This fringe round about organized religion is much more considerable in America than elsewhere. In the Old Country the line between the churched and the unchurched tends to be sharply drawn. It is not so in America. Among intelligent people there is a 'concern' for religion, even though that concern is speculative rather than practical. It is represented in the universities and colleges. It is largely represented in business circles. In one of the magazines, *Fortune*, which is primarily an organ of big business, there are series of articles on religious issues by men like Maritain and Hocking, and by business men themselves. These men are studiously careful to keep their skirts clear of the churches. They seldom go to church and they almost never join a church. Yet they are serious lay interpreters of basic religious ideas. Any account of the religious life of America to-day will be false to the facts if it ignores the presence of this mid-world of persons, not hostile or indifferent to religion but also not ecclesiastically or theologically minded.

KIERKEGAARD has not won for himself a large place in the history of philosophy, as reacting from the Hegelian idealism; but it looks as though he will have a definite and distinct place in the history of Christian theology, as providing a philosophical background for the Barthian movement. He has certainly been a centre of interest in theological circles in the last decade or two. And English-speaking theologians are much indebted to his translators, and especially to the Rev. Walter Lowrie of Princeton.

Recently Dr. Lowrie has added to the debt by translating KIERKEGAARD'S last work.[1] As it was his last work, so it is almost the last to be translated into English. Its matter is not on the whole very attractive; it is so full of repetition, and the satirical quality of it is not such as to commend the author to most of us. But the translator rightly claims that it is invaluable to any one who would understand KIERKEGAARD'S life and thought.

[1] *Kierkegaard's Attack upon Christendom, 1854–55* (Milford; 15s. net).

It is significant that this last work of KIERKEGAARD was not published *first* in English, as it was in German, and—as it would appear—in every other language into which he has been translated. It was obviously an anti-clerical if not an anti-Christian interest that prompted its so early publication. No one in Britain or America has felt a compelling urge to translate it to the discomfiture of the Church. Thus it comes about that, appropriately enough, this Danish thinker's last work appears in English almost last.

Of course there are people in Britain and America who may welcome the chance of reading a notable example, as this is, of popular diatribe. There are people too in these countries who may also welcome the chance of discovering what is positive and positively edifying among so much that is merely negative. There is also another consideration, which is well expressed by Dr. Lowrie in the words that follow.

'It is a curious and a rather ironical reflection that many who would condemn the *Attack* as a whole will find parts of it very much to their liking. Free Churchmen will find S. K.'s criticism of an Established Church more forceful than their spokesmen have produced; the many Baptist sects will welcome his criticism of infant baptism (although in fact S. K. was not disposed to discard it); Quakers will relish the diatribe against a "hireling ministry"; and Catholics (Roman Catholics at least) will sympathize with his outspoken preference for a celibate clergy.'

It may be gathered from the foregoing that in this work KIERKEGAARD indulges freely the spirit of criticism. Particular institutions, beliefs, and practices are attacked, but the outstanding feature of the work is its attack upon 'Christendom' in general, as he found it *in parvo* in Denmark. The term itself, thinks this author, is a mockery. There are very few Christians in 'Christendom.' He is not at all sure that he is a Christian himself; he is quite sure that the very great majority of those who think themselves Christians are not Christians at all.

'The religious situation in our country is: Christianity (that is, the Christianity of the New Testament—and everything else is not Christianity, least of all by calling itself such), Christianity does

not exist—as almost anyone must be able to see as well as I. We have, if you will, a complete crew of bishops, deans, and priests; learned men, eminently learned, talented, gifted, humanly well-meaning; they all declaim—doing it well, very well, eminently well, or tolerably well, or badly—but not one of them is in the character of the Christianity of the New Testament. But if such is the case, the existence of this crew is so far from being, Christianly considered, advantageous to Christianity that it is far rather a peril, because it is so infinitely likely to give rise to a false impression and the false inference that when we have such a complete crew we must of course have Christianity too.'

The above is a somewhat mild sample of a position that KIERKEGAARD states over and over again in this work. He rings the changes on his contention that 'Christendom' does not stand for the Christianity of the New Testament. And when we inquire what the Christianity of the New Testament is, here is the kind of answer we get.

'The Christianity of the New Testament rests upon the assumption that the Christian is in a relationship of *opposition*, that to be a Christian is to believe in God, to love Him, in a relationship of opposition. While according to the Christianity of the New Testament the Christian has all the effort, the conflict, the anguish, which is connected with doing what is required, dying from the world, hating oneself, etc., he has at the same time to suffer from the relationship of opposition to other men, which the New Testament speaks of again and again: to be hated by others, to be persecuted, to suffer for the doctrine, etc. In "Christendom" we are all Christians—therefore the relationship of opposition drops out. In this meaningless sense they have got all men made into Christians, and got everything Christian—and then (under the name of Christianity) we live a life of paganism.'

The translator admits that KIERKEGAARD'S diatribes, particularly those against the priests of an Established Church, are often outrageous; though he is sure that where they wound most deeply the effect is most salutary. This is to show an extraordinary deference to one whose severity of outlook was almost pathological. Yet it is reassuring to find that, in the midst of KIERKEGAARD'S fierce attack upon the Church established in Denmark, he did something through his really edifying preaching to make his contemporaries understand that in attacking the Church he was speaking from within it, and not from without. But satire is a weapon that often defeats itself.

'The Church Which is His Body.'

BY THE REVEREND W. F. LOFTHOUSE, D.D., WOODSTOCK, OXFORD.

OF all the ambiguous terms which have laid waste theological discussion none has been more fertile of confusion and heart-burning than the word Church. It calls up some of our dearest memories and shapes some of our most daring hopes, linking us in a sacred union with our fellow believers and with Christ Himself. Yet we cannot begin to talk about it without perplexing and alienating other Christians, as earnest and sincere as ourselves. Is the Church one or many? Is it an organization or a spirit? A loyalty to men or an obedience to God? It moves, we say, like an army; yet we see it rent by schisms and distressed by heresies. Even the New Testament itself adds to these uncertainties. What is the relation of the Church which is to suffer the fate of the Laodiceans to the Church which is the pillar and ground of the faith, the very body of Christ? No wonder that, wrapped in such a cloud of unknowing, it cannot speak to us, neither can we plead for it.

The first thing to be done is to go back to the New Testament, ambiguous as its language may seem. No other teacher can speak to us without raising the disturbing question, 'By whose authority?' One thing we can at least say, that if we listen to language about the Church which does not echo the words of the New Testament, we shall be justified in hesitating about adopting it. In this paper I propose to concentrate on the writings of St. Paul. I do not forget that two sentences about the Church come to us as Dominical; but unhappily they are too brief and obscure—some would add, their authenticity is too doubtful—to enable us to base any confident conclusion on them. The use of the word in the other New Testament writers is

for the most part incidental. It is St. Paul here, as in other subjects, who is the exponent of clear and precise thought.[1]

But when we turn to St. Paul we cannot but be surprised at the paucity of his references to the Church. Again and again, when we should have expected them, and when his expositions have indeed made them almost inevitable, for some reason he is silent. Indeed, save for one Epistle, to the Ephesians, and two sentences in the sister Epistle, to the Colossians, and once, if it be Pauline, in the Pastorals, he speaks only of individual churches, or of convictions and practices shared in common by them. So does his friend Luke in the Acts; so do all the other writers, unless they are quoting, like the author to the Hebrews, from the Old Testament. It is to local churches that St. Paul's letters are addressed. In their affairs, their problems, their triumphs, their quarrels, he took immense interest. He carried the cares of them all on his shoulders. The spread of Christianity was the spread of these little communities round the Mediterranean. He insisted unweariedly on their integration. Every member had his duty to his church, his gifts for his church, his claims on his church. Each member in fact had the same relation to his church and its other members as a limb has to the other limbs in the body.

Yet the churches, though distinct, were not independent. They had been founded by the same preaching. They shared the same faith, the same experiences, the same gifts, and the same type of ministry, though the lists which St. Paul gives of the ministers of the churches are not identical with one another, and still less identical with the three-fold ministry of later days. They used the same religious language. They cherished the same religious hopes. They all knew Christ, the Messiah, as Lord and Saviour. Quite enough, this, to mark them off from all the rest of mankind. From the first, the churches were in regular communication with each other. A Christian would be a member of the body in any church he might visit; and this, not simply because the various churches professed the same formulæ, but because in every one of them was the same Christ, the ground of their hope, the breath of their life; with whom, as St. Paul bade them remember, they had been buried in baptism, and in whose resurrection they lived anew in the Spirit. But now, at the last, when he is no longer able to visit the churches, when he has more leisure, in his long days of imprisonment in Rome, to think of their common needs and of his hopes for them, we suddenly find him speaking, in the Ephesian Epistle, of *the* Church, passing at once from the plural to the singular, and using for the first time an expression which, for good or evil, has made history as no other word of the kind has succeeded in doing. The expression, however, occurs only in three detached passages even in this Epistle, though from the subject matter we might have looked for it more often.

Let us turn then to the first of these passages. '(God) gave Him (Christ) to be head over all things to the church, which is His (Christ's) body, the full content of him who is fulfilled (or, filled up, not filleth) wholly in all things' (Eph $1^{22f.}$; cf. Col 1^{18}). Here we must obviously ask what is meant by 'body' in this connexion. As opposed to 'flesh,' which, when it does not refer, as the corresponding Hebrew phrase often refers, to all mankind, means man in his weakness, frailty, liability to sin and corruption, body is morally neutral. The deeds of the body must be put to death in the spirit (Ro 8^{13}); but the redemption of the body is a synonym for adoption (Ro 8^{23}), and Christ is to be glorified in the bodies of His disciples (1 Co 6^{20}; cf. Ro 12^{1}). In 1 Corinthians, especially ch. 12, another aspect of the body is developed, as an integrated organism, in which each limb or member has its special function to perform in relation to the body as a whole and to all the other limbs. This is applied to the Christian community. Individual Christians are members of the body, and severally one of another, as they are also said to be the several parts of a growing building, each fitted to the rest.

Of this body, Christ is the head, as He is the head of all the co-operative members (cf. 1 Co 6^{15}). They are to grow in all things into the head, Christ (Eph 4^{15}). The corresponding Hebrew term is frequently used for that which comes first, in order of importance or authority; the head (as in our modern usage) becomes the ruler. This meaning does not occur in the word as used in the New Testament save in our Epistles (Ephesians and Colossians) and in one passage in 1 Co 11, where God is the 'head' of Christ, Christ of the man, and the man of the woman. Here the reference is plainly to authority and subordination. The same is surely true of Eph 1^{22}; the head is

[1] The word *ecclesia* occurs 111 times in the New Testament. In 83 of these, the reference is clearly to one or more local churches. In 9, the singular is used in a comprehensive or collective but concrete and non-mystical sense; *e.g.*, Ac 9^{31}, 'the church throughout all Judæa and Galilee,' etc.; 1 Co 12^{28}, 'God hath set some in the church, first apostles,' etc. In seven instances, we find the Church or Churches *of God*, collective or individual; once only, (Ro 16^{16}) 'all the churches *of Christ* (salute you).' In Ephesians and Colossians, the 'mystical' use of the Church occurs 11 times; Colossians also contains 2 instances of the local use; Philippians has only the latter, once collective (3^{6}) and once individual (4^{15}). The remaining instances are the 2 in Matthew (16^{18} and 18^{17}); 3 in translation from the LXX; and 3, of the assembly at Ephesus (Ac 19).

the ruler of the body, as of the limbs which belong to it. This view is an essential element in the Pauline Christology. The body is here identified with the Church; and the body, the Church, is then amplified in the mysterious clause which follows; it is the full content of Christ, as the body may be said to be the full content of the head; that is, the embodiment of all its activity. It is noteworthy that this conception of the body and its members is further developed in Ephesians, though without reference to the Church (ch. 4). Jews and Gentiles are reconciled in one body to God, acting and co-operating together in obedience to the head (2^{16}; cf. 4^{12-16} and Jn 1^{16}).

The next passage which concerns us is in ch. 3. The Apostle is thinking, as so often, of his own special position and privilege in the apostolate. Though less than the least of all the saints, there had been committed to him the resplendent task of preaching the now open secret, hidden through all previous ages, that to the ruling authorities of the heavenly regions might be made known the many-coloured wisdom of God, according to the actual purpose which He had formed in Christ, *through the Church*. At first, this is startling enough, the more so if we think of the Church as we have hitherto met it, as the aggregate of the local Christian communities on earth, with all the weaknesses which the Apostle makes clear in his various letters to them. Are we assisted if we think of the Church in its other aspect, as the body ruled over by its head, Christ? It would be easier to answer the question if we could be sure of the nature of those authorities of which he speaks. Are they the supernatural powers of darkness against which the Christian has to wrestle (Eph 6^{12})? Was the Apostle thinking of some Gnostic heresy spreading in the Lycus valley; or are these 'authorities' angelic powers who can know nothing of the secret of redemption till they see it in the members of the Christian churches who have passed from death unto life? This is not the place to discuss the problem in detail; Armitage Robinson[1] speaks here about the 'inquiring powers of the heavenly sphere,' distinguishing them from the powers in ch. 6; strangely, he does not comment on the words 'through the Church' here. We need simply note that as it is, in the Apostle's thought, the function of the body to grow up in all things into Christ, and to know the love of Christ which surpasses knowledge, in order to be filled up with all the full content of God (3^{19}), so it is the function of the Church to proclaim its discovery in the sphere of heaven as well as on earth; and the glowing thought is carried one step further at the end of the chapter, the ascription of glory to God in the Church and in Christ Jesus. The characteristic meaning of glory is the full manifestation of the essential properties of God. That this glory dwells in Christ, in whom they are summed up or find their complete reckoning (Eph 1^{10}), is familiar; but if this is true of the head, it is also to be true of the body, the 'full content of the head.' The juxtaposition of the two is unique; but it would seem to follow quite naturally from the passage at the end of ch. 1.

In ch. 4, with the elaboration of the doctrine of the growing body, there is, surprisingly, no mention of the Church; but we come to our third passage in ch. 5. Here, as before, the Apostle shows no intention to develop or expound a doctrine of the Church. His reference to it arises, as it were, by the way. In the middle of ch. 4, at v^{17}, after the impressive passage on the growth of the body of Christ, he turns to the type of conduct to be expected of the 'new man' in Christ, and the sins to be avoided, giving warnings (apparently, as in Corinth, they were needed) against the grosser misdeeds, and emphasising, as he always does in these sections, the forbearance, gentleness, control of speech, and warm kindliness, which must be characteristic of the attitude of the members of the body to one another. This leads him to the striking picture of the whole community in ch. 5^{15-21} (concluding with the words 'being subject to one another in the *fear* of Christ'); and he then turns, as in the parallel in Colossians, to the family—wives, husbands, children, slaves, masters. And it is here, unlike the parallel passage in Colossians, that we come upon the Church again. The wife is to be subject to her husband, her head, as the Church is subordinate to Christ. Husbands are to love their wives as Christ loved the Church, a love which He showed in giving Himself for her, to present her to Himself, glorious and spotless, cherishing and nourishing her as the husband is to cherish his wife, 'for we are members of his body.' The husband must love his wife 'as he loves himself,' even as Christ loves the Church. Finally, this mention of husband and wife recalls to the mind of the Apostle the passage in Genesis which had been more than once on the lips of our Lord in dealing with marriage; 'the two shall be one flesh,' which the Apostle speaks of as a 'great mystery,' to be applied, he says, to Christ and the Church. Are we to conclude from the Apostle's use of the word 'mystery' here that he had already made it an open secret to his readers, or was he perhaps thinking of the pagan mystery, the ceremonial of the *hieros gamos*, which would be familiar enough to the majority of his converts in Ephesus and the neighbourhood?[2]

[1] *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, ad. loc.*

[2] The author of Revelation speaks of the bride and the wife of Christ (the lamb), 19^{7} $21^{2.9}$; cf. 22^{17} ('the

On the face of it, the argument seems to proceed from the more to the less familiar, as if the Apostle's readers would be more at home with Christ's love to the Church than with the husband's love to his wife—another suggestion that they must have been already acquainted with the doctrine. Whether this was so or not, we are led to the further picture of Christ presenting the Church to Himself, perfectly sanctified—the term would recall the Levitical sacrifices. This was the end of His self-surrender for her. Is this presentation to Himself thought of as in the distant future, or in some timeless world? The conception is not easy. We should have expected that Christ would present the Church, which He had redeemed, to God; it is through Christ, throughout the New Testament, that we have our access to the Father (*e.g.*, Eph 2^{18}). As it stands, the figure might suggest the rescue of Gomer by her husband the prophet Hosea, or even, perhaps, an anticipation of King Cophetua and the beggar-maid. But equally noteworthy is the Apostle's reticence. The husband, he says, is to love his wife as Christ loved the Church; but he nowhere speaks of the Church as actually the wife or bride of Christ.

Such are the data for St. Paul's conception of the 'mystical' Church. It is the body of which Christ is the head, and His 'full content'; assigned as such to Christ by God, who placed everything under His feet. It is to bear its witness of the divine wisdom to the unseen powers of the universe, linked with its head in ascribing glory to God; and it is a heavenly figure, redeemed, cherished, and lifted to ceremonial spotlessness by the self-surrender of her head (the alteration of gender in the pronoun is inevitable) and surrounded by His protecting love.

It is clear that this goes beyond anything we find elsewhere, either in St. Paul or in the rest of the New Testament. When, and whence, did he become possessed of this idea? We can only guess. Did it shape itself in his mind as a glorified counterpart of the heavenly powers by which some of his readers were obsessed? We know too little of the incipient heresies of the time, and of the Apostle's idea of them, to risk a conjecture. On the other hand, the conception must have taken shape recently. Otherwise, how could he have left it unmentioned in the passages in Corinthians and Romans where he is dealing with the body and its members, in language which all his commentators transfer, unwittingly, as it would almost seem, to the Church? Indeed, the supposition that it had hardly become as yet an integrated part of his own thinking would seem to follow from his neglect of the very word in the great section in the body of Eph 4, where to our thinking it is all but on the tip of his tongue.

One assertion, however, we can make with confidence. All the terms which the Apostle uses of the Church in these two Epistles he has often used elsewhere: head, body, subjection, glory, presentation, spotlessness, mystery, love. He is drawing on a well-known and often used vocabulary. Moreover—and it may be that here we find the clue to our problem—everything which he here predicates of the Church he has already predicated of the believers to whom his letters are addressed. Is the Church subject to Christ? *We* owe to God, and to Christ, the obedience of complete subjection. Is the Church His body? *We* are the body of Christ, and severally members of one another. The individual believers are the body, and the body is to grow up into Christ, its head. We, like the Church, have been set in heavenly places; we, like the Church, have our conflicts to wage there; and we, as the Apostle is never tired of reminding us, are set for the praise and glory of God. Moreover, Christ's love is for the individual—'He loved me and gave Himself up for me'—as, in the Ephesian Epistle, for the Church. The word '*present*' is frequent in St. Paul, though elsewhere he uses it in a somewhat different sense. We are to present our own bodies, our own limbs, to God, like so many tools (Ro 12^1 6^{13}); they are not to be the instruments of sin. Food does not commend or present us to God; I, says the Apostle, shall be presented in the power of the Resurrection, along with you; just as he himself longs to present his followers, like a consecrated virgin, to Christ (here we are nearer to Eph 5), and indeed he labours to present every man complete in Christ (2 Co 4^{14} 11^2, Col $1^{22.\ 28}$).

Thus, all the materials for this conception of the Church lay ready to his hand. A reader of the Ephesian letter, who was familiar with what the Apostle had hitherto written, might well say, 'all that I find here of the Church I have known, or aspire to know, of myself.' And indeed there is nothing in our Epistle to modify that immediate relation between Christ and His disciples which the Apostle made so clear before he so much as mentioned the Church. There too we conceive of the whole body developing and growing like a building, a temple, or a cathedral; gaining fresh beauty and majesty from generation to generation, it owes its inspiration and experience to the work of the Holy Spirit; and its pattern and design, slowly but triumphantly revealed, is nothing but the cosmic obedience of the Son to the Father. Even with regard to that 'fulness,' St. Paul prays

Spirit and the bride'). But the 'bride' is the Holy City, which comes down out of heaven; 'mystical,' no doubt; but it can hardly be equated with the 'mystical' figure in Eph 5; much less identified with the Church on earth, universal or denominational.

elsewhere in this Epistle that *believers* may be filled to the full content of God (Eph 3^{19}; cf. Col 1^{19} 2^{9}).

What then is new in our Epistle? The heavenly figure of the Church itself, set in the heavenly places, and there enjoying and fulfilling all the experiences, in the full rôle, as it were, of believers in Christ on earth. For if, being redeemed by Christ, we form one body here on earth, and that body belongs to Him, may we not, must we not, think of that life, that being, that body, in which we already share as one, receiving what we have all received, and doing, in the sight of God, what we, in our earthly companionship, do so imperfectly? For we ourselves are moving in the heavenly places, where what we call past and future are no longer distinct, and where mind and heart can behold the beauty of a crystal of which body and wife are, so to say, separate facets.

At all events, we can see what the Church, in St. Paul's conception of it, is not. It is not a being to whom any authority over its members has been delegated. Indeed, the two phrases, so common on our lips, members of the Church, and the Church of Christ, are avoided. The latter is only found in the appendix to the Epistle to the Romans (16^{16}); on the other hand, 'the church, the churches, of God' is common. The Church is neither a holy mother, nor a tutor to bring us to Christ. It has neither privileges nor knowledge nor power denied to the humblest of Christ's followers. It is not called to teach or command or warn. That is the duty of the Apostle himself, and of the possessors of the appropriate gifts in the churches. It has, as we have seen, but one function which St. Paul does not constantly connect with us Christians on earth; this is its revealing to the powers of the super-earthly realm the mystery of God. Yet in that realm we too have our place and our conflict. There is no such thing as the dependence of the Church on a hierarchy, a bureaucracy, or a ministry of any kind. Its functions are the functions of all Christians. Nor is there any hint that the Sacraments are controlled or ratified by the Church as such. But if it is not given as a guide or authority to sinful men, it is the aggregate of redeemed sinners who are members of one another, whose bodies are temples of the Holy Spirit, who are to be presented holy and spotless to Christ, and who are to judge angels.

If, then, St. Paul did not reach this conception till comparatively late in his life, why did he not make more use of it when it was reached? Surely we might have expected some reference to it in the great paragraphs on the humiliation and exaltation of Christ and the prize of the high calling in the Epistle to the Philippians, in the warnings against false and self-appointed teachers and the delineation of the new man in Colossians—every preacher knows how he would instinctively refer to the Church in dealing with these texts—and the equally striking sentences on the reconciliation wrought by the Cross and the blessings won by the Ascension in Ephesians itself. What opportunities, we are inclined to think, the Apostle has lost. If they were lost, it was because the conception of the Church in the heavens, though now clear and definite in his mind, did not dominate his interest. He was too closely aware of the intercourse between his Master and himself. He was too anxious for his converts, in their own churches, to reach that level of conduct, mild, tolerant, patient, forgiving, which he describes so eloquently in all these three Epistles, and which has been so rarely attained in the history of hierarchical Christendom. The Church is up yonder in the heavenly realm; but his concern is with the churches here. For a hierarchy, indeed, there can be no place in the Church as St. Paul conceives it. Individual communities, as they spring up everywhere, will need the ministers, the servants, who devote to the common interests and needs their special endowments of eloquence, insight, organizing ability, sympathy—by whatever name, apostles, evangelists, elders, overseers, they may be known. But the doctrine that the Church which is the body of Christ, and possesses the fullness of its head, the head to which all the members are joined directly in functions and privileges, is inseparably linked to a three-fold ministry or a line of successors of Peter in the Vatican, could only have aroused in St. Paul a protesting *me genoito*.

Admittedly, it is not easy to think ourselves back from our modern presentations of the Church to one which, at least on the surface, is so different.[1] But it would be a disastrous mistake, especially in these days, to neglect so exalted and impressive a conception as that of the Church, the aggregate of

[1] The following passages from Gore's *Ephesians* will show how easily some modern conception of the 'Church' slips into discussions of apostolic texts in which the word is absent: 'The church of God had, in St. Paul's present belief, widened out from being the church of one nation into being a catholic society, a society for all mankind . . . The free admission of the Gentiles into the Church is, with the accompanying hostility of the Jews, assumed' (p. 8). Judaizers 'had been trying to make it evident that the Church of God was as much as ever the people of the Jews' (p. 9). 'If faith and faith alone is that whereby men are justified or commended to God, then at once the catholic basis of the reconstituted Church is secured' (p. 11). 'The Church of the reconciliation is God's elect body to represent a divine purpose of restoration far wider than itself. . . . This universal reconciliation through a Catholic church was God's eternal purpose' (pp. 71 f.).

all believers, militant and triumphant. Perhaps Dante caught something of this truth when he figures the souls in Purgatory, as Mr Charles Williams would remind us, as the mount of Purgatory itself; or when, in the *Paradiso*, he sees the redeemed combining to produce some mighty shape of a cross or a great symbolical letter in the heavens. Wherever there was an Israelite indeed, there was the true Israel. The Church is all that the individual believer is meant to be, will be, is. But, as the believer is well aware, what he is he shares with others; even in his local church and its fellowship he is aware of this. He feels that he is greater than he knows. And when he lifts his eyes to heaven, he sees Christ where even now his life is hid, seated at the right hand of God. He sees the Church, as it were himself as he is worth to God; and not less himself because it is the self of all those with whom on earth he shares and hopes to share the most precious things he knows; holding them all the more firmly, indeed, because they are thus shared.

The more he can say 'our,' the more he will be able to say 'my.' The Christians' grasp has overtaken their reach. They know that God has raised them up as He raised Christ; and they can speak of this, not in the future tense only, but in the past, because it is the present which, of the Church, is eternally true. Where Christ is, there is the Church; and where the Church is, there is every believer; for the Church itself can receive no more than is assured to every believer in the infinite mercy of God. So he can take his part, as he drudges through his daily tasks, in making known to the unseen powers the many-coloured wisdom of God. And in the celestial ceremony, raised above all the limits of time and space, wherein Christ presents the Church, clothed in all its glory, and crowned by all His love, to Himself—a ceremony infinitely more majestic than any performed in the heathen temples, he sees himself actually presented without spot or wrinkle. He has learnt

> While on earth, in heaven to be;
> God, by sense unseen, to see.

I am not suggesting that our own usages of the word should be dropped because they have no place in the New Testament. They are far too deeply embedded in our language for that. Whether Christianity could have maintained its position in the world without these later developments is another question. But we cannot afford to neglect the high apostolical view of the Church which our language constantly tends to obscure. It lies at the root of all Church fellowship, denominational or œcumenical. And when it is grasped and held firmly, it will at least carry us beyond those lamentable ambiguities which, by leading to the identification of the Church with some type of ministry or organization or authority, have divided where they should have joined, and have dimmed the glory of the Head of the Church which it was the function of the Church to reveal.

Literature.

LIFE AFTER DEATH.

Life After Death (Ryerson Press, Toronto; $2.00) is the title of a new book by Professor John M. Shaw, D.D., of Queen's Theological College, Kingston, Canada, which aims at offering a statement on the Christian view of the future life that shall be 'consonant at once with modern scientific thinking and with the specifically Christian revelation.' The book covers a wide area of topics, but within its compass of a hundred pages the author has to abide by summary statements on various issues.

The distinctive features of this study may be put as follows. Resurrection and life are the portion of the believer now, and this life is not interrupted by death. It continues after death as an embodied life, a 'spiritual' body other than the material body that decays. The statement, therefore, in the Westminster Shorter Catechism concerning the souls of believers that 'their bodies being still united to Christ do rest in their graves until the resurrection,' is not Christian but Jewish and should be excised from a Creed professing to be fully Christian. Further, the author is critical of the earlier phrase in the Catechism statement that 'the souls of believers are at death made perfect in holiness and do immediately pass into glory.' Over against this we must put a more dynamic and progressive view of the future life. Growth and development, variety of service and reward, must be a law of the future as it is of the present.

What guarantees this future life is faith-union with Christ. Upon the resurrection of Christ the New Testament faith is founded; but at this point a crucial difference is present. The believer's 'resurrection' is not as His was. Nothing of His mortal body was left behind to suffer corruption, but all was transformed, 'absorbed by life' into a spiritual body. This took place for evidential purposes, a sign to His disciples of His triumph over death. Unique it was, yet according to the writer altogether natural and reasonable for 'it

was the natural correlative of the moral uniqueness of His life.' And by this event His new life becomes the generating principle of the deathless life for the believer.

What, then, of those who are not 'in Christ' at death? On this topic, which occupies the concluding part of the book, Dr. Shaw says we do well not to be dogmatic. He holds that our choice must be between the Universalist and Conditional theories of ultimate destiny, and that the latter view is more in line with Scriptural teaching and with the moral probabilities of the case.

Dr. Shaw writes incisively, and both ministers and lay readers, as he hopes, will profit by reading what he here presents. Some of these, however, are likely to feel an over dogmatism in parts of his exposition. He hardly does justice to those who agree that New Testament religion is rooted in experience of Christ's continued activity in power, but who have difficulty in tethering that conviction to a doctrine of the body of Jesus as here expounded. These will also feel that some of the Pauline analogies, such, for example, as that of the seed, which apparently Dr. Shaw thinks important, is really of very little value in the sphere of the mystery and future of personal life.

J. Macleod.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE EUCHARISTIC SERVICE.

Dom Gregory Dix, O.S.B., Monk of Nashdom Abbey, is a very learned liturgist, and as a student of comparative religion can present things liturgical in a broad setting. His recent very notable volume, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (Dacre Press; 45s. net), concentrates upon the Eucharistic service, and yet—elaborate as it is—does not purport to be a 'History of the Liturgy.' It might serve as such for a beginner in the subject; so it is allowed. But to be scientifically adequate, says the author, such a History would require a different sort of treatment. In particular, it would have to reckon with the new theories concerning liturgical origins; and not only so, but also with the new theories, arising out of those others, concerning liturgical history as a whole. It is already clear, however, as the author adds, that the time is hardly ripe for that scientific reconstruction of which liturgical study stands in need.

We must, then, accept the author's word for it that this is not so much a technical manual (though some who may handle it may regard it as technical enough) as a book for the intelligent Christian—perhaps mainly the intelligent ecclesiastic—and him especially of the Anglican communion, 'who is anxious to acquire a practical acquaintance with the subject as it now stands, in order to make what use of it he can in solving the formidable and occasionally desperate practical problems presented by living the life of the Body of Christ in our own times.'

What are we to understand by the 'shape' of the Liturgy? By that is meant the standard structure underlying most of the varying rites and all of the older ones. It has almost everywhere remained unchanged for more than eighteen hundred years, 'overlaid yet never refashioned.' It had its first formation in the semi-Jewish church of the Apostolic Age. It persisted ever after that, not because it was 'apostolic,' but only because it fulfilled certain universal Christian needs, or—in other words—provided a universal road to God.

Here is a relevant quotation, incidentally affording a good specimen of the author's style: 'The intricate pattern of local variety overlaid on the unchanging apostolic core of the rite is the product of history. It is the proof that the Christian liturgy is not a museum specimen of religiosity, but the expression of an immense living process made up of the real lives of hosts of men and women in all ages and circumstances. Yet the underlying structure is always the same because the essential action is always the same, and the standard structure or Shape alone embodies and expresses the full and complete eucharistic action for all churches and all races and all times.'

The origin of this work was a paper read at their request before the Cowley Fathers during their General Chapter in 1941. The paper dealt with specifically Anglican interests, but the work as it now appears (it was first published in January 1945, and reached a second edition in August 1945) subordinates the Anglican to the Catholic. Sixteen of the chapters deal with the common inheritance of all the baptized, 'the legacy of our common Mother before our family quarrels had grown so sharp and tragic.' Only one chapter (but a long one, filling one-sixth of the book) deals with Anglican interests, treating of certain changes made in the Anglican rite at and after the Reformation, and of difficulties of the liturgical situation in Anglicanism at the present time.

I cannot attempt to indicate the rich and varied contents of this scholarly work, much less to discuss its historical and positive judgments. I can but commend it as a weighty contribution to a great subject.

W. Fulton.

THE POLITICAL IDEAS OF RICHARD HOOKER.

This brief study—*The Political Ideas of Richard Hooker*, by Mr. E. T. Davies, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net)—shows clearly, as the Preface indicates, that the author 'is intimately acquainted with Hooker's own writings and has read much both of earlier and later date which is relevant to an understanding of them.' The subject is a most interesting and important one, and Mr. Davies provides a useful survey.

The first chapter deals with the Presbyterian Background. Here the writer views Puritanism from something like Hooker's standpoint, but perhaps without all Hooker's 'charity and meekness.' Generalization as to the attitude of Presbyterians (or Puritans, for the two seem sometimes identified and sometimes not) appears occasionally a little hasty; and there is overmuch dependence

on Knappen, while it is a pity to have Cartwright quoted not directly but through Professor Scott Pearson, as elsewhere Rutherford, Baillie, and Saltmarsh are only reached through Woodhouse.

Chapter II. gives a short account of Hooker and his *magnum opus*, and stress is rightly laid upon the unity of the work, Hooker's ability to trace questions back to first principles, his strong historical sense, his dislike of Puritan scripturalism, his fear of the attitude of extremists towards secular learning, and in short the gulf, theological and temperamental, separating him from Puritans.

Attention is next directed to Hooker's examination of the meaning of Law, the order God has set down for Himself; that which He has appointed for Nature, the law of human nature, with knowledge and will as fountains of action, right conduct being based on reason; and some related matters from Book I. including again the place of Scripture.

With regard to the Basis of Political Obligation we are told that it is central with Hooker that the force of Law is based on consent, though he was no democrat and indeed approached a doctrine of absolutism.

The final chapter takes up the treatment of the problem of Church and State in Book VIII., 'the most controversial and unsatisfactory portion of Hooker's *Laws*,' it is said. Hooker's general position is mildly Erastian as contrasted with Calvinistic Theocracy; and we have the famous sentence: 'There is not any man of the Church of England but the same man is also a member of the Commonwealth, nor any man a member of the Commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England.'

It is perhaps right to point out that (p. 22) Melville of course could have had no dealings with Mary of Guise, and the title of Knox's tract is not perfectly exact; (p. 63) the title of *Lex, Rex* is reversed; (p. 72) the quotation from Burke in note 2 reads as if credited to R. H. Murray and some words are omitted; (pp. 20 and 85) the Hippocrates allusion appears twice in this small volume, as does (pp. 17 and 82) a quotation from Figgis. These are small matters and the work as a whole leaves the impression of careful investigation at once appreciative and critical. Hooker, sincere, courteous, learned, and broad-minded, well deserves to be fully studied, and this latest examination and tribute is welcome.

G. D. Henderson.

A STATESMAN'S SERMON FOR THE TIMES.

It is ground for gratification to all Christian folk when a national leader takes his stand also as a Christian thinker and an exponent of the application of Christian principles to public affairs. Except for one short paragraph in which he quietly states his own belief in a Socialist solution, there is nothing of the party politician in Sir Stafford Cripps's little book, *Towards Christian Democracy* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). With wisdom and suggestiveness it makes a strong appeal to the membership of the churches to make their impact felt in the practical affairs of the world. 'A spirit of intolerance of evil, not in the abstract, but as seen and experienced daily in the life of our own and other nations,' he says, 'lies at the root of moral leadership in the world.' 'The problem of human relationships is the most vital and important part of industrial efficiency.' And he offers as a new and more practical creed, 'I believe in the brotherhood of all men, whatever their race, colour, creed or class, as taught by the divine life of Christ, and I pledge myself, without thought of my own interests, to work unceasingly to establish by my daily actions that measure of justice and equality in my own country and throughout the world which can alone form the basis for a happy Christian community of life amongst all the peoples. I will never give in to the powers of evil or to injustice and inequity however much I may suffer personally by my resistance. I will fight on ever, here as there, because I believe that thus alone can Christ's Kingdom be established here on earth.'

It may be suggested by a reviewer in entire sympathy with Sir Stafford's criticism of the Church that it may be overstated. After all Paul wrote a famous chapter on charity, and it was by good deeds that the early Christians impressed their heathen contemporaries, and for practical Christianity that St. Francis and St. Vincent were canonized, and the Salvation Army is as earthly in its activities as other-worldly in its theology. The Church has been a sympathetic mother to movements of Christian Socialism; Methodist lay preachers were the early backbone of the English Labour party. The official and orthodox doctrine of the Church has always been that genuine Christianity should combine the worldly and the other-worldly reference.

What is new to-day is not a reform of the officially sanctioned doctrine of the Church on this matter, but that, under the influence, even if it be unconscious, of the modern Marxian philosophical principle that theory and practice are the same, the Church has now the insight and courage to denounce as hypocrites and heretics those who are content with theory alone, and to preach that, however prayerfully pious, the non-practical Christian is a humbug. Such preaching as this, and there is much in all the churches, will be encouraged and stimulated by Sir Stafford's book.

R. W. Stewart.

PSALM XVI.

It is not often that a degree thesis, even when presented for a doctorate, reaches so high a level as that presented to the Catholic University of America by Rudolph P. Bierberg under the title *Conserva Me Domine* (Catholic University of America Press, Washington). It is an acute and thorough study of Psalm 16(15). The work falls into two parts, the first dealing with the text and outward sense of the Psalm, and the second with its deeper interpretation. Both involve a wide survey of the subject and reveal an extensive

study of the relevant literature, a feature of the work which is further indicated by the bibliography at the end. The author's standpoint is, of course, traditional, and he keeps well within the limits imposed by the Biblical Commission, while his interpretation is that normally regarded as conservative. The non-Catholic reader may feel that there is a strong tendency to special pleading, and that the writer sometimes does not understand his opponents—or people whom he regards as his opponents. But he certainly does his best to be scrupulously fair, and, at the same time, he is not afraid to speak strongly when he feels strongly. The one irritating feature of the book is in the transliteration of Greek and Hebrew words. To the 'unlearned' reader they are no more intelligible than if they were printed in the normal types, and they look awkward—and are sometimes a little puzzling—to those who are familiar with the Biblical languages. But this should not deter us from welcoming this faithful investigation of an important piece of Scripture.

T. H. ROBINSON.

In recent months we have reviewed several numbers of the series of studies in the thought of some outstanding Christian thinkers that Messrs. James Clarke are publishing under the general title of 'Modern Christian Revolutionaries.' This month we notice the third number: *The Wild Knight of Battersea: G. K. Chesterton* (4s. 6d. net), by Mr. F. A. Lea. The volume is written in a vivid and picturesque style by one who admired Chesterton greatly, though critical of the episode of his conversion to Roman Catholicism. Chesterton's allegiance to Rome is here said to be 'his first great error.' However, there is more made in these pages of Chesterton as a philosopher and man of letters than of Chesterton as a student and devotee of religion. Indeed a fuller account of Chesterton may be desiderated, in which this last aspect of him would receive longer treatment. Apart from published works, the articles he wrote from week to week for many a year in 'The Illustrated London News' would be a rewarding source of material.

The Philosophy of Jesus (Dent; 5s. net), by Dr. Harry Roberts and Lord Horder (who have each written at least one book on Health), is an attempt to epitomize the 'philosophy' embodied in the Parables, the expositions, and the other sayings and doings which reliable tradition has brought together under the name of Jesus. The authors are not concerned with Jesus the Christ, or Jesus the Son of God, and perhaps it is well; for they do not move with precision among such conceptions. But they *are* concerned with what Jesus taught, and with its background and environment. There are also some interesting quotations in the book, the greater part of which, however, is a catena of passages from Jesus' teaching. The authors think they have presented in this book 'the philosophy of real Christianity' (surely too portentous and cumbrous a phrase) freed from things that irritate.

Methodism's Message in Modern Terms, by the Rev. H. Mortimer Sinfield (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net), is a little book of old-fashioned sermons on such themes as salvation, holiness, assurance. There are a number of illustrative anecdotes and analogies, not all of them dependable however. Here is one example. How is assurance of salvation reached? Partly by faith, partly by its visible, tangible results. Then follows the illustration. Motoring into Scotland he passed the road-sign marking the Border, and believing the information, he was sure he was now in that country. Presently his assurance of this was confirmed by the actual kilts, plaids, tam-o'-shanters, bagpipes and haggis that were ample evidence that indeed it was Scotland.

God and the Atom, by the Right Rev. Mgr. Ronald Knox (Sheed & Ward; 7s. 6d. net), is a subtle, profound and witty discussion of the possible effects of the newer physics and the atom bomb on religious thinking. On one point he holds a very definite opinion, namely, that the use of the bomb on Hiroshimo without a preliminary harmless warning demonstration of its power has lowered our self-respect.

A very fundamental problem is raised by the assertion of modern physicists that the ultimate discernible feature in their universe is chance, and the atom bomb has suddenly brought home to the ordinary mind the importance of what had seemed abstruse mathematical speculations. If physics reveals in the random disintegration of atoms a region of pure absolute chance, what then becomes of all the arguments for the existence of God that are based on any contemplation of Nature? Mgr. Knox thinks it possible still to deny that a region of absolute chance has been discovered. For the puzzle remains to intrigue the physicist why uranium and thorium and radium atoms should disintegrate at different average rates which have a constant ratio. Does not this point to something intrinsic as yet undiscovered which is not explained, as many uniformities in the ordinary realm of experience are not explained, by averages?

He offers the suggestion that the revelation of atomic energy may incline men to dwell more on the power of God, and the fact that the energy suddenly released was there all the time, actively at work in constituting the very nature of the atom, helps the imagination towards the conception of God the Creator continuously sustaining the universe. Further, the fact that the atom is not a passive mass but is held together by such tremendous interlocking forces gives a hint of the true way to sense the integration of personality and of society.

In his final chapters Mgr. Knox argues that just as presumptuous optimism was the sin of a more prosperously progressing age, undue despair may be the temptation of an age dominated by uncertainty and fear. This may be a period of purgation, and the call is for the virtue of hope.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

'Going off with a Bang!'

By the Reverend Derrick Cuthbert, B.A., B.D., Birkdale, Southport.

'With the temptation . . . the way of escape.'—1 Co 10^{13} (R.V.).

How would you like to sit on an explosion? It sounds rather painful, to say the least; but Mr. Colston Shepherd, the air correspondent of the B.B.C., has tried it, and six hours later he was at the microphone telling listeners about it. Of course, he did not get off entirely scot-free. Nobody who allows himself to be hurled fourteen feet in one-fifth of a second by a charge of explosive is going to feel as if nothing had happened. But all that happened to Mr. Shepherd was a headache for an hour or so, and a stiff neck for a little longer.

But why sit on an explosion anyway? Unless you happen to be one of the very few people who make a living by being 'shot out of a cannon' in the circus, what is the point of it?

For a long time scientists have been puzzling over the best way to help the pilot to get out of a high-speed aeroplane when something has gone wrong and he wants to take to his parachute. The cockpits of these aeroplanes are so small, and wind pressure at high speeds is so troublesome, that sometimes an unfortunate pilot cannot manage to free himself from the falling plane at all. At other times the pilot has succeeded in jumping out, but his plane has been going so fast that before he could fall clear (even when he has turned the aeroplane upside down) the back wing or tail has given him a severe blow and seriously injured him. The latest idea, which is only just leaving the experimental stage, is, quite literally, to make him 'go off with a bang,' to blow him out of the aeroplane by an explosive. Underneath the cockpit seat is a cartridge containing the charge; above the pilot's head is a metal handle. Having got rid of the cockpit-hood, the pilot pulls down the handle. A blind covers his face to protect it from the sudden rush of air, the bolt holding the seat to the plane is withdrawn, and the cartridge goes off, hurling him, still in the seat, right away from the machine. A blow from his fist, and the seat falls free; a jerk, and the parachute opens. He descends safely to the ground.

This is a perfect example of the stern measures we often have to use to save ourselves in an awkward situation. I hope it may never fall to our lot to blow ourselves up, but I am sure that if we found ourselves in a disabled aeroplane we would do it cheerfully and thankfully.

There are, however, other awkward situations which are far more likely to come our way. In them, too, we shall find over and over again that the way out, the way to safety, is the painful way of telling the truth or doing the right thing. Sometimes, yielding to an impulse of fear, we tell a foolish lie. As soon as we do so, an awkward situation has arrived. If we persist in that lie we shall find that it leads to another, and the second one leads to a third . . .

> O what a tangled web we weave
> When first we practise to deceive.

Soon our reputation for truth-speaking will have crashed, and it will be a long time before we can set it up again. There is a way out of that danger, a way out of the awkward situation created by the first lie. It is to own up, to tell the truth. Yes, it is hard! But it is the chance God gives to us to escape from something far more disastrous.

Or sometimes we find ourselves involved in the beginning of a quarrel. We feel ourselves getting hotter and hotter; tempers are rising. Nasty things are being said to us and we are just about to say even nastier things in return. If it goes on, something will crash, something really dreadful will be said, a friendship will lie in ruins. There is a way of escape, and it is best taken at the very beginning. It is not easy, in fact it is painful, but it is far better than riding this quarrel to its bitter end. What is it? If we know we are in the wrong, it is to say so and to apologize. If we are in the right it is to keep silence, even, perhaps, to walk away with jeers and taunts ringing in our ears, until tempers have cooled and the matter can be discussed in a sensible, friendly fashion.

God does give to us, as Paul said, the way of escape in temptation, and if we really want to do His will we shall use what He gives, however difficult it may be, for we shall know that His way is best.

A Symbol to be Proud of.

By the Reverend John V. Wilson, Stechford, Birmingham.

'I bear . . . the marks of Jesus.'—Gal 6^{17} (R.V.).

The first time I went to the Lake District I got a big thrill. Did it come from the mountains and their crowns of ever-changing clouds? No. Or from the lakes always slightly stirring on the surface and reflecting beauty in a hundred different ways? No. The mountains were beautiful, and they were the first I had ever seen, for there are no mountains in the south of England where I was born—the whole scenery was beautiful of course as it always is, and I enjoyed every bit of that holiday, the camping, the walking, going to church in a boat, meals in the open air, but not one of these things caused the thrill. Let me tell you what it was—*I saw a steam-roller!*

Yes! You may think what you please, perhaps I have been studying too hard, or I may have

been sitting in the sun a little too long; perhaps the worries of church life have turned my brain a little! I may appear normal, but I must be more than a little queer, if I am thrilled by such an ordinary thing as a steam-roller. Why, it has none of the graceful lines of a modern motor-car, and its speed is vastly inferior to that of a Spitfire, and (to girls at any rate) it is just a dirty, noisy, rather smelly thing.

Well, here is the explanation. Every county has its own sign, perhaps worn on the uniform of a famous regiment, or on school caps and blazers. That of Yorkshire, for instance, is a white rose and that of Warwickshire a bear holding a staff. I expect you know your own county sign very well, and whatever it is I am sure you are proud of it. Now my home is in Kent, where my family has lived for many generations and our county sign is a 'white horse rampant,' that is, standing on its hind legs. This is perhaps the oldest county sign in England, for it was on the banner of Hengest, the leader of the English when they first landed in Britain about four hundred and fifty years after Jesus was born and that landing was made on the coast of Kent. Now there is a famous engineering firm in the county which makes steam-rollers and sends them all over England, and every one of them bears on the front the famous white horse. So in this way, with nine other counties in between and nearly three hundred miles separating us, I was reminded of Kent and of my home. Since then I have seen these steam-rollers in many other parts of England, north, east, south, and west, and I even met them when I lived in Scotland. Very often my friends have been surprised to see me greet a steam-roller with affection and salute an image of a white horse—but to me of course it was much more than a steam-roller that stood puffing away in the road, it was a visible link with home, a reminder of the things I loved.

But there is a greater sign than any county one, and that is the sign of the Cross, for that is a reminder of Jesus and His great love for us. In one of the first letters he wrote as a Christian missionary, St. Paul thinks of this and makes proud boast about it. Men had sought to belittle and decry him—he who had once been a proud Pharisee, bearing all the marks of that position among the Jews—now he was called the slave of Jesus Christ; the term was one of contempt, as later were such words as 'Christian' at Antioch and 'Methodist' in the eighteenth century. But Paul is not ashamed. In another letter he says that to the Jews the Cross was an offence and to Gentiles foolishness—but because it showed a greater power and a truer wisdom it was the power of God.

So he is not ashamed but proud of his position. Slaves, he remembers, carry with them their master's mark, it may be a sign branded on their body, a special chain or collar, or a badge on their clothes. Soldiers, also, sometimes tattooed their commander's name on their arms. Again, worshippers of pagan gods then, as to-day, marked themselves with the god's special sign. 'Very well,' says St. Paul, 'I am a slave, but a willing one and I will bear my Master's sign gladly; I am a soldier proud of the badge of my army; and I am not ashamed of my religion. "I bear . . . the marks of Jesus."' Yes, you may be proud of your county and its symbol, of your school and its badge, of your country and its flag, but the greatest thing is to be a Christian and to bear boldly and proudly, like a banner, 'the marks of Jesus.'

The Christian Year.

SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT.

Casting Out Unclean Spirits.

'And he called unto him the twelve, and began to send them forth by two and two; and gave them power over unclean spirits.'—Mk 6^7.

We think that we know all about this mission of the disciples, for we have perhaps heard the narrative scores of times, but do we know all about it? Are we sure that we have not read it through our twentieth-century spectacles and formed a distorted vision? If we were asked what the disciples were sent out to do, we would no doubt reply, 'They were sent to preach the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, and to tell the people about Jesus the Messiah.'

We would be right up to a point; they evidently did something of the kind, for later on in this Gospel we are told that they summoned their hearers to repent. And all that seems to us quite reasonable; it is what religion, or at least the Christian religion, has always done. But if we imagine that was all, we are wrong.

This account of what our Lord said to the disciples when He sent them out—and it is the earliest account we have—does not mention preaching. It mentions only one thing: 'He gave them authority over the unclean spirits.'

Now to persons like ourselves, with our modes of thought and unconscious presuppositions, this is a startling fact.

We must not suppose that this is an isolated passage with no corroboration from the rest of the New Testament. On the contrary, we are told that Jesus Himself frequently healed those who were possessed by evil spirits and that He regarded this as one of the demonstrations of the proximity of the Kingdom of God. The note of power and authority is constantly sounding in the Gospels, and it is carried on into the Epistles and the Acts, which give us knowledge of the temper of the Apostolic Church. The Apostles are not preachers only of a 'new doctrine'; they had, or believed that they had, some unique spiritual power and authority derived from Christ. All this may be very shocking to the modern mind, but it is difficult to see how anyone who cares to study the documents can doubt that it is what they say.

We live in an age which is dominated by scientific rationalism. There are signs that it is coming to an end, but its influence on the mind of educated

persons is as yet undiminished. To men imbued with this intellectual colour the aspect of the Christian faith which is now before us is totally alien.

For my part, I have never been able to see that the results of science in general, or those of psychology in particular, furnish the smallest logical ground for denying the existence of spirits, either good or evil.

Let us, however, concede—for the sake of the argument—that 'possession' and 'unclean spirits' are hypotheses not required by science; does this decide the question of their reality? Certainly not, for we know that there are many things, including our own personalities, which science does not need to postulate, but which indubitably exist. But we should not be too confident that the hypotheses may not be required, because we notice that the word 'possession' is creeping back into works on morbid psychology.

Whatever we may think of these speculations, it remains only too certain that the facts which men of old attributed to 'possession' remain, and demand, not only explanation, but remedial action. We have not exorcised an unclean spirit when we have labelled it 'obsession' or 'neurosis.'

Is it not true that the need for a campaign against unclean spirits is as urgent as ever? The kind of wickedness which we have in mind goes deeper than a looseness of behaviour. There is a stage of degeneration which vividly suggests the idea of possession. The victim of this spiritual disease began with ordinary sensuality and lack of self-control, but he has not stopped at this. He has become, as St. Paul would say, a slave or an instrument of sin. His values have been corrupted, so that we can no longer say his will is weak, but must go further and say his will is perverted. There are men and women who have come so much to rejoice in iniquity that they derive a perverse pleasure from spreading corruption to others and seem to have a horrible kind of disinterested enthusiasm for vice.

It was the opinion of Plato that evil is always self-destructive and, therefore, weaker than good, and the belief is approved by many other thinkers. Doubtless this is true, on a long-term calculation, and no one who believed in God would wish to dispute it, but it appears not to be true when we are concerned with short periods. Observation would lead us to conclude that there are persons whose vitality and effectiveness are actually enhanced by the evil purpose which they have embraced—persons in whom a demon energy seems to show itself in a manner which can only be described by the word 'possession.' There are others in whom an insatiable lust for power or, what is more dreadful still, for sheer destruction reaches superhuman dimensions. But this obsession, if such it is, does not weaken them; on the contrary, in some cases it appears to endow them with a resolution and mental concentration which may have the effect of an elemental force. To-day at least, we have ample opportunity of noting the devastating consequences of spiritual wickedness in high places.

The original disciples were given authority or power over the unclean spirits. There is no ground for supposing that this endowment was intended to cease with the first generation of Christians and, therefore, we who claim to belong to the company of the Apostles and to be members of the Apostolic Church must have the same duty and a like power. Though the methods may be different, the work is the same. And here perhaps it is relevant to make some remarks about the methods.

There is a real danger that exaggerated hopes may be placed on the ability of psychology to solve our problems. We have fanatics of psychiatry as well as of religion and they would persuade us that by analysis and other techniques the personal and social ills that oppress us can be removed. May we call your attention to one remarkable fact. In spite of the notable advance of psychology, and the medical art related to it, the evil itself is not diminished. There is, besides, another fact which cannot be explained away—the increase in the number of suicides. The late President Masaryk, who was a considerable philosopher as well as a great statesman, begins his book on modern civilization by pointing out the amazing truth that, in spite of all the increase of comfort and amusement which civilized life afforded, the number of those who found their lives intolerable and ended them steadily grew. In his opinion, the main cause of this disquieting phenomenon was the decay of religious belief, and the reason which he gives would be corroborated by an examination of the cases which come to our own notice.

It is certain that one way by which the disciples of Christ are called to cast out the unclean spirits of recklessness and despair is by propagating a sound and living faith. A vast mass of men and women are to-day living in a world which seems to them to have only two aspects. Their experience is confined to the sensations of the present and hopes and fears of what is yet to come. They lack the dimension of depth—or to change the metaphor, they have no roots. The preaching of the gospel has, as one of its objects, to open men's eyes to the dimension of depth, to disclose to the soul tossed about by the storms of time the real and tranquil world which encompasses him and from which he has come, to speak to him of the Father of spirits and the life of the world to come.

Here most plainly, in an ideal order, the priest and the psychiatrist would find scope for co-operation. When the expert psychological healer has unravelled the tangle of a confused personality he must aim at helping his patient to adjust himself to the world, so that he may take up again the activities of normal living. But to what world is the patient to be adjusted? That is a question which has not been sufficiently considered. Is it to be perhaps the world as imagined by materialists, one in which there are no absolute values and can be no supernatural hopes? Then, when the patient has had time to consider, he may well decide that the 'real' world is not more

encouraging than that from which he has been rescued. The integration of a personality can be completed only when it is adjusted to an integrated world—that is to one which centres upon God.

If that could be done, it would be very much, but if we are to believe the New Testament, it is not all. It is not enough to have good and true beliefs about God and His care for us; the Church of the Apostles went out into the world with power over the unclean spirits, and it would be hard to discover any reason why this power should have been withdrawn. Those who were oppressed by the devil in those far-off years of the dawn of Christianity were not only given a creed to hold, they were released by a word of power.

Must we not conclude that the Church to-day needs to be more completely assured of its inherent power and to see more clearly that it is engaged in a war on unclean spirits? We ought to manifest authority—not of a venerable tradition only, but of a body indwelt by the Holy Spirit.

The way must be found by experiment, but surely the way is there, for the mission and the gifts of the Church of God do not change.

Much that we have been thinking about may well seem to some of dubious value and questionable validity, but of one truth we may all be certain—that we need the power of God to deal with the unclean spirits within ourselves. If we have ever really grappled with temptation, and felt the strength of tendencies within us which do not seem to belong to our real selves, but which threaten to take control; if we have begun to understand the experience behind St. Paul's cry, 'There is a law of sin in my members which wars against the law of my mind'; we shall never suppose that enlightened ideas or orthodox belief alone will meet our desperate need. We must have a power, the power of the Spirit, which can overwhelm the evil that has lodged within. Let us hold fast to that. The cleansing Spirit, who works in the disciples of Jesus, is no myth or form of words, but a reality offered and available to us. The one obvious and immediately practicable step which we can take to further the crusade against unclean spirits is to see that we ourselves are walking by the Spirit. Who can tell what influence from Him may go forth from us for the healing of other distracted souls?[1]

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

Observing the Winds and Regarding the Clouds.

BY THE REVEREND A. CAMPSIE, M.C., M.A., K.H.CH., R.N.

'He that observeth the wind shall not sow; and he that regardeth the clouds shall not reap.'—Ec 11[4].

This Book of Ecclesiastes contains a somewhat sombre philosophy of life, yet thickly scattered through its pages there are bright and sparkling gems of wisdom. And while we may not accept some of the writer's conclusions that is no reason why we should not profit by the many shrewd observations he makes in arriving at them. There is a profound truth in these words of our text. Probably the writer was acquainted with some farmer who was heading straight for ruin through his attitude to the weather. Farmers are proverbially inclined to grumble at the weather, but as a rule they go on with their work and somehow manage to achieve good results in spite of it. But this man's weakness was much more serious than a tendency to grumble. For him conditions were just never right for getting on with the job on hand. There was always something to prevent him doing the work he should have been doing. In the spring there were high winds, and so he put off his sowing until too late. 'What's the use of attempting anything on days like these?' he would say, 'the wind will only blow my seeds away.' And then in the autumn there were the heavy clouds that threatened rain, though they might not bring it, and again he would put off reaping from day to day until there was nothing in his fields worth harvesting. And so for one bad reason or another he was making a complete mess of things, and taking the sure road to disaster. The obstacles in the way and the chances of misfortune always made him feel that prompt and purposeful action was futile and scarce worth while.

It may be said that that is an unusual attitude in a farmer compelled as he is to win a livelihood in spite of the vagaries of the weather. What is true is that it is by no means an uncommon attitude in people towards the urgent tasks and pressing duties of life. The thought of some difficulty or other is constantly preventing them from getting on with the job. The chances of success seem to be so strongly against them that they throw in their hands and do not try. They surrender weakly to unfavourable circumstances without a fight. Because they cannot see their way plainly to the end of the road they decide not to set out. It is a common failing and one we need to guard against. There are adverse winds blowing on every walk of life, and dark clouds come up on every horizon. And we can think so much of these things that we have no zest for the obvious task we should be tackling and have no energy for the plain duty we should be facing. And that is the certain way to ruin and defeat—'he that observeth the wind shall not sow; and he that regardeth the clouds shall not reap.'

In these present times there is, I think, a particular need for us to be on our guard against this very real danger. There are bleak and bitter winds swirling about our lives to-day and there are plenty of ominous and lowering clouds. We have come to the end of a war, but we have not found anything that can rightly be described as peace. There are troubles around us on every hand. The measure of security we might reasonably look for even in this uncertain life is denied us. There is a disturbing amount of suspicion and distrust between nations which are curiously described as 'united.' We have passed out of one set of dangers

[1] W. R. Matthews, *Strangers and Pilgrims*, 82.

only to be caught up in another. Incalculable hazards seem to stretch out endlessly before us, and at times the prospect looks pretty grim and uninviting altogether. And insidiously it is ' getting many down,' as the saying is. They find themselves growing cynical in outlook. They have little faith in any efforts that are being made to mend matters. Less and less are they themselves inclined to join in them. ' What's the use,' they say, ' when it seems so obvious that they are doomed to fail ? ' Many have fallen into that mood to-day, and many more will have to keep a grip on themselves if they are to avoid it. For it is a fatal mood, and if it becomes a bit more widespread it will ruin all possibility of any harvest of peace or happiness in this world. It must be sternly resisted. Whatever the prospects, it is for us to get on with the business of doing all *we* can to put things right. If the clouds are darkening we must use the time that is still ours to the fullest purpose. Instead of slackening we must double and redouble our efforts. Don't let the prospect depress you. Don't give up trying. Put all you know into the task of building a new and better world. Deepen the old familiar channels of service and keep on devising new ones. Stick to the job. Let nothing daunt your spirit. Let nothing quench your zeal.

I think that when as a people this mood of defeatism (for that's what it is) comes over us and threatens to make us slacken our efforts, we need to remind ourselves of another hour in our history —' our finest hour ' as some have called it—when in the face of winds that were hurricanes and clouds full charged with thunder, we went on doggedly despite the bleakest of prospects to win out to where we are to-day. It might well have seemed to us then, observing the winds and regarding the clouds, that all our efforts were useless and our chances of success non-existent. But we kept on, each with his or her own task. With a united determination, unparalleled in our history, we held steadily on until the job was finished and the victory won. It is a renewal of that same spirit that is needed in us to-day. Storm and cloud are still with us, and the path ahead looks full of perils—and it is likely to be hard going. But if, despite the forbidding outlook, we all keep on working for peace with something like the same united determination as we had in war to attain our end, then this can become even a finer hour in our history. We can achieve a far nobler triumph, a real victory, and under God's providence we can be the means of bringing the fair harvest of peace and ordered living to a much troubled and fear-ridden world.

But yet more important, we who are of the company of Christ need to remind ourselves when that mood steals over us, that it is a denial in spirit of Him whom we call Lord. It is quite clear alike in His teaching and in His life that ' observing the wind ' and ' regarding the clouds ' in the sense of our text is utterly contrary to His mind and spirit. In unlikely quarters He saw fields white unto harvest if only there were found those who were ready and determined to go out and do the job of reaping. He sent His disciples forth to their work and commanded them to carry it on however unpropitious the prospects. ' I must do God's work to-day,' he said, ' however quickly the night may come down upon it.' His way was always to get on with the business of the moment whatever winds of adversity were blowing, whatever clouds of discouragement were gathering. Surely that is plain throughout all His ministry. There came a time when He could not disregard the clouds, when to Him it was obvious that they would soon empty their deluge upon Him. But on He went, helping, healing, teaching, comforting, sowing the good seed ' in season and out of season ' and in all kinds of soil. Right up to the last the work went on. There was never with Him any thought of futility about it. The supreme sacrifice did not empty of meaning the simple service. Whatever might come, the business of the moment had its own importance. That was Christ's way, and it must be our way too. Whatever the future may hold for us, whatever dangers and disasters may cast their shadow over us, there is for us our daily Christian duty and service to be done. That remains for ever worth while. And if we neglect it we are failing our Lord and failing our fellow-men, and contributing our part to the desolation of the harvest field.

It seems to me that what Christ is demanding of us in these perplexing days is just a redoubling of our devotion to Him and to our Christian work and duty. Apart from the common troubles of these days we realize that a new cloud has begun to overshadow our lives. As yet it may be no bigger than a man's hand, but what it may soon become God only knows. Man has unleashed from Nature a force far beyond anything hitherto known. What is to come of it ? How is he to control it ? Judging by his record it may seem that he will never be able to confine it to useful and beneficent purpose—it may seem that each day is bringing the world inexorably nearer to the final cataclysm. So regarding the cloud, there are many who are slipping into the way of believing that nothing they can do can make any difference. They are surrendering in spirit to what they believe to be the inevitable. They are giving up all efforts to alter things, to make things better. Anything they can do, they feel, is futile, and so they do nothing.

That is the sure road to ruin. And in a Christian it involves at once a betrayal of Christ and a betrayal of his fellow-men. There is nothing inevitable about the course which events will take. It is not beyond the power of man, with the help of God, to change his ways, to change himself. Hidden deep in his nature there are untapped sources of immense spiritual power (comparable with the atomic energy hidden in matter) which only needs to be liberated to enable him to turn his whole life into a new and nobler direction. His capacity for goodness and for greatness (as Christ saw so clearly) outmatches even his capacity for evil. But how to bring these energies into play ?—that is the question. There is, I believe, only one way. Only under the influence of Christ

and in contact with Him—Christ who is the Fount and Source of all spiritual power—can the good latent in man find outlet and be brought into full play. 'Christ or catastrophe' is to-day the writing on the wall. Pacts and agreements amongst national leaders will achieve nothing, unless these are the expression of a great outflow of Christ-inspired sentiment in the peoples they represent. And how can the spirit and power of Christ get to work save through those who know Him and His spirit and His power in their lives? It is a solemn hour in history we have come to. Above all it is a solemn hour and fraught with responsibility for us the followers of Christ. Let us get back to our Master, as did the disciples in their time of need. Let us wait upon Him with a new diligence and a fuller devotion. Let our observing of the wind and our regarding of the clouds fill us with a new energy to work and strive while it is yet day, and while the opportunity is still with us. So shall we be faithful to our Lord. And so shall we best serve our generation, and, please God, play our full part in leading the world into a new and better way.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Mission of the Master.

BY THE REVEREND RODERICK BETHUNE, M.A., ABERDEEN.

'Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life.'—Jn 14^{6}.

It is commonly said that Jesus came into the world to fulfil a specific mission. We may have accepted that statement without question and, in a vague kind of way, may feel that the world is a better place for His coming. If, however, we were pressed to state the precise particulars in which we personally have benefited from His coming, we might be slightly embarrassed.

If that is the case, then, of course, there is something amiss. For Jesus everywhere stated that He had come to make a contribution to our human life, to every man's life, by which it would be for ever richer and fuller and more interesting, something without which life, however prosperous and comfortable and apparently effective, is indescribably poor. As a matter of fact, He defined the contribution He came to make in the words of this text—'I am the way, the truth, and the life'—and if, at first, such words don't convey much to us, don't speak of things we are conscious of lacking, they deserve to be pondered until their full significance is appreciated and appropriated. For in these words Jesus describes the service He came to render, not only to His own contemporaries, but to us who live amid the almost unparalleled difficulties of our time.

1. 'I,' said Jesus first of all, 'am the way.' He spoke the words to men to whom He had made clear the way in which life could be lived with satisfaction to themselves, with profit to their fellows, and with honour to God.

Is His service one which our generation needs to have rendered to it? What strikes you most about the world in which you and I are living? Is it not that men everywhere are conscious of having taken a wrong turning somewhere and are aware that, if the mistakes, the sorrows, and the suffering of the past are not to be repeated, the right road must at all costs be found? Why are the representatives of the United Nations meeting in conference in London? To find a way of life which will ensure peace and security and happiness for all men. And what strikes one when one thinks about the world strikes one when one thinks of individuals, for what is happening on a macrocosmic scale is happening, equally, on a microcosmic scale. 'Are you happy?' asked William Booth of his fellow-passenger as one day he travelled in the same compartment with Cecil Rhodes who had by then achieved fame and position and wealth. 'Happy?' said Rhodes, 'Good God, no!' Isn't it what many men and women would have to say to that question were it put to them? Some of them have, as Rhodes had, every condition believed to be conducive to happiness, but, in spite of that, there is in their hearts a strange dispeace.

Such a world and such men were very familiar to Jesus. He lived in that kind of world and met every day that kind of man. 'You are questing for a way of life which will bring happiness to yourself, profit to your fellows, and honour to God?' He seems to ask. 'Then, that is exactly what I have come to show you. I am the way. If you would live life aright, you must be loyal, as I have been, to what you know to be true, and there must be room in your scheme of things for love and for sacrifice.'

Francis Drake's biographer tells us that when that notable sailor sailed the seas 'there were no lightships moored in the estuaries of the Thames, like the Mouse, the Swin, and the Outer Gabbard, to blink the sailor safely down his channel. No line of buoys marked out for him a fairway. He must find his own way over sandbank and swirling current. In the fogs of winter he must pick his road across the North Sea with no more than a lump of tallow in the hollow of his lead to pilot him into his ports.' The service which some have rendered to shipping Jesus has rendered to men for all time. By His words and by His life He has marked out for us a fairway, so that we can say of Jesus what Joseph Conrad once said of John Galsworthy in a letter which he wrote to him—'Your words . . . are more valuable than all the money in the world—they help one to live—while the money enables one only to exist.'

2. 'I am the way,' said Jesus, and 'the truth.' He said that to men who were puzzled as to the ultimate nature of things, who sometimes caught themselves wondering whether life had any meaning and God any interest in His world. 'Let us see that behind everything there is, not just an abstract principle, not a blind force, not an indifferent Deity, but a God who is a Father with a personal interest in each one of us,' said Philip, speaking, we may be sure, for the others as well as for himself, 'and we shall be satisfied.' 'I am

the truth,' said Jesus, in response to that request. 'I bring you the ultimate truth about life and about God. He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. For my love for the least and the lowest and the last is but a reflection of His.'

What Jesus felt Himself to be doing for His contemporaries He does for men and women in every generation—He brings them assurance concerning the meaning of life and the interest of God in every creature of His hand.

A friend of mine whose child on one occasion lay dangerously ill told me that he asked his doctor to tell him frankly what the position was, whether there was any hope of his child recovering or whether there was none. In response to his request, however, he received a reply that was ambiguous and uncertain. Perhaps the doctor didn't know the answer, or perhaps, knowing it, he feared that the father couldn't take it. 'But,' said the father, suspecting that the doctor was trying to spare his feelings, 'anything, even knowing the worst, would be better than this state of uncertainty.'

That man's feelings are shared to-day by many. 'Tell us, if you can, the truth about things,' they say. 'If life has no meaning and God no interest in us, say so, but if life has a meaning and we are of consequence to God tell us plainly, only don't leave us in a state of uncertainty in which we are the prey of all kinds of fears and doubts.'

Across two thousand years Jesus says to all who are in such a case precisely what He said to men who found themselves in such a position in the days of His flesh—'I am the truth.' 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' True, we cannot prove His statement as we can prove a proposition of Euclid—but, before we dismiss His words on that account, it would be well to bethink ourselves of the support they receive from His life and from His death and from His final vindication. He is a fact—every bit as real a fact as the other facts which we feel we must consider when we are seeking some assurance concerning the nature of things, and He dare not be left out of our reckoning when we are trying to decide whether behind everything there is a blind force or a God who cares.

3. 'I,' said Jesus, 'am the way, the truth—and the life.' He said that to men who, having had the way of life indicated to them, found themselves incapable of pursuing it. 'I am the life,' He said, by which He meant them to know that He understood their difficulties and that unless they abode in Him, even as the branch abideth in the vine, they could never resolve them.

Are we any different from the men to whom Jesus made that pronouncement? We know that Jesus came into the world revealing the way of life, but how to follow such a way is our problem, so that our prayer is often that of John Drinkwater:

> We know the paths wherein our feet should press,
> Across our hearts are written Thy decrees,
> Yet now, O Lord, be merciful to bless
> With more than these.
>
> Grant us the will to fashion as we feel,
> Grant us the strength to labour as we know,
> Grant us the purpose, ribbed and edged with steel,
> To strike the blow.

Likewise, we know that Jesus gives assurance that love is at the heart of the universe and that purpose is in control of it, but sometimes the evidence to the contrary is so overwhelming that we find His assuring statements difficult to believe. To us, as to the men of His own time, He says, 'I am the life'—by which He means *us* to know that He understands our difficulties and that, if we would resolve them, we must abide in Him as the branch abideth in the vine.

He came, let us be clear, not only to reveal an ideal life, but to communicate strength for its attainment. He came, not only to make statements concerning God's love and interest, but to confirm them by the life He lived and by the death He died and by His victory over the tomb. He who was the life of His men in ages past, who transformed them from a cringing company into a militant, striking force, who gave them confidence to say, even when life was doing its worst, 'we are persecuted but not forsaken, cast down but not destroyed,' wants to be, and can be, our life now, can give us strength to fulfil our resolves and confidence to believe, whatever may befall, that behind everything there is, not a blind force, but a God who cares. He came, in other words, to make all of us more than conquerors, but, if we persist in running our race without looking unto Him, can we be surprised if our promises far exceed our achievements and our doubts sometimes quench our faith? 'Let me into your life,' He says, 'and old things will pass away and all things become new. For I am life.'

We have often heard it said that Jesus came into the world to fulfil a specific mission. We may have accepted such a statement without question and may have felt, in a vague way, that the world is a better place for His coming. I hope we shall be vague no longer about the blessings He bestows. He came to be the way, the truth, and the life, not just to the world at large, but to you and to me.

PASSION SUNDAY.

Christ's Determination to Die.

BY THE REVEREND J. R. COATES, M.A., BIRMINGHAM.

'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.'—Mt 16^{24}.

Among all the occasions on which our Lord spoke of His death, none is so impressive as that at Cæsarea Philippi, which marks the turning-point in His ministry. Let us think first of the Scene, then of the Symbolism, and finally of the Secret.

(1) Here is a picture of *the place*, drawn by George Adam Smith:

> 'You come to the edge of a deep gorge, through which there roars a headlong stream,

> half stifled by bush. An old Roman Bridge takes you over, and then through a tangle of trees, brushwood, and fern you break into sight of a high cliff of limestone, reddened by the water that oozes over its face from the iron soil above. In the cliff is a cavern. Part of the upper rock has fallen, and from the *débris* of boulders and shingle below there bursts and bubbles along a line of thirty feet a full-born river.'

From this account it is evident that the place was a perfect natural sanctuary.

It had indeed been held sacred from time immemorial. In the days of Joshua it was regarded as the dwelling-place of Baal. When the Greeks came, they dedicated the cave to Pan and the Nymphs. And when Jesus and His disciples arrived on the day of which we are thinking, they would see a beautiful white marble temple, built by Herod the Great in honour of Augustus Cæsar, probably on the top of the cliff, where the Muhammadan shrine of St. George now stands.

(2) So much for the scene: now for *the Symbolism*.

(*a*) First there was the grotto of the Greek god Pan, standing for the worship of Nature.

(*b*) Then there was the temple of Cæsar, the symbol of military and political power.

(*c*) The third symbol was the river itself. The Jordan is the most mysterious and tragic river in the world, and its wonderful course makes an impressive illustration of the life and death of Jesus. Some of the springs of Jordan can be traced to their very beginning in the surrounding hills; but this bursting forth at Cæsarea is a miracle: just as there are genealogies which partly account for the coming of Jesus, and yet the most important element in His nativity is hidden away in the deeps of God.

As you follow the stream, the parallel becomes even more striking.

The small lake, twelve miles to the south, which is called the waters of Merom, reminds us of the glimpse we get of the boyhood of Jesus at twelve years of age reflecting as in a mirror the colour of heaven. Then, after a rapid descent, comes the Sea of Galilee, busy with fishing, swept by sudden storms, with beauty and fruitfulness upon its shores—a picture of the strenuous early ministry of Jesus. The Sea of Galilee is nearly 700 feet below the level of the ocean, and the descent of the river into such a depth would have been considered marvellous had it not been that this is but the prelude to a still deeper plunge. The ministry of Jesus in Galilee would be the chief wonder of history if it were not for that darker service which followed.

From Galilee to the Dead Sea the Jordan falls more than 600 feet, reaching almost 1300 feet below the Mediterranean at last.

Just as Jesus set His face steadfastly to the city of death, so the fated stream runs swiftly toward the Dead Sea. It is a headlong career—stern, uncompromising, hidden from men in growing solitude—and the end is—death.

What a symbol of the death of Jesus is that awful sea. The end of Jordan is even more mysterious than its beginning; even as the Cross is the mystery of mysteries. Geologists tell us that this sea was once part of the universal ocean, but that by some cataclysm it was cut off, and shut down in the heart of a gigantic cleft. And in the agony of the Son of man are not

> Tides of the whole great world's anguish
> Forced through the channels of a single heart?

No sea is so salt as this sea of death: even as the sacrifice on Calvary is salted with the salt of all the tears of the world.

What more fitting symbol can we find for the life and death of Jesus than this purposeful river, which bursts almost full-grown from beneath the rock at Cæsarea?

Here is the zest which the Greeks had tried to embody in capricious gods. Here is the force which the Romans had tried to find incarnate in their Cæsar.

What can we know of His mind, as He prays there at Cæsarea, accepting His destiny?

(3) Through the scene and through the symbolism we draw near to *the secret*.

Our Lord and His disciples were fugitives. They had fled from the blind hatred of the Pharisees and from the blind enthusiasm of the Galileans.

Christ was praying. What was in His mind as He prayed may be gathered from the question with which He suddenly turned to His disciples. Watching Him at prayer, as three of them were to try to watch five months later in Gethsemane, they were startled by a question which was itself a revelation. 'Who say the people that I am?'

Jesus had not shown before any signs of thinking about Himself. So they tell Him what they have heard. The people think He is one who has lived upon the earth before—John, or Elijah, or some other prophet. Did you ever reflect on the fact that common people got that impression from what they saw of Jesus. It is profoundly significant. There was something about Him that was unearthly, even to the most casual of observers.

The disciples had not recovered from the shock of this abrupt question, which leapt out at them from the heart of prayer, when there came another still more pointed. 'Who say *ye* that I am?' It seemed as though their Master were feeling after something which it was in their power to give Him. Then Peter's answer flashed back: 'Thou art the Christ.'

What follows shows that His mind was made up. What was involved in Christ's determination to die can never be fully understood. The Gospel context, including the story of the Transfiguration, makes us aware of an inner compulsion, a conviction that justifies Moses and Elijah, and lays hold of eternal life. By complete self-giving the Son of Man begins at last to taste the powers of the world to come.

The crude historical realism of the word 'Cross' makes it clear that Christ was committing Himself

to a course which meant challenging the Roman Empire in the name of the Kingdom of God—and in the power of it.

Peter's understanding of the Master's destiny was superficial, and required correction. That swift, majestic, 'Get thee behind me, Satan,' shows what power there is in the acceptance of the Cross. The disciples had never seen just this dignity in Jesus before. He had spoken with authority, and He had cast out devils. But hitherto it had been only somehow, vaguely, the finger of God. Now, they had seen their Master's soul ablaze in the eyes that opened upon them out of prayer. That day in the gorge, at the spring of Jordan, had given them a new Jesus. It had indeed given them the Christ. However little they understood the mystery of it, the Lord's determination to die was for them the key of the Kingdom of Heaven. The authority of His determination was laid upon their souls.

We are coming rapidly to a very pointed application. We know how feeble those men were. Setting aside the case of Judas Iscariot, which was abnormal, the rest were ordinary men, such as we are ourselves.

> 'And He said to them all, If *any* man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me.'

He says the same to-day. This present service gives us one more opportunity of coming under the spell of Christ's determination.

What does it mean? To determine is to delimit, to mark out and set bounds to the way of life which lies before us. It means to cease from dreaming. It means to make that inward surrender whereby our eyes are brought back from all selfish aims and ends, to front with concentration straight down the pathway of immediate duty. Christ did that. He could do it because He knew God so well that He trusted Him to the uttermost. And He lives to-day to be the strength of our doing it.

PALM SUNDAY.

The Time of our Visitation.

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, B.D., B.Sc., KILLERMONT.

'Thou knewest not the time of thy visitation.'—Lk 19^{44}.

The Sunday before Easter has been called 'Palm Sunday,' as an annual celebration of the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem on the Sunday before His crucifixion. On that day Jesus seemed for once to have had some kind of worthy reception. He came riding on an ass, making, as Matthew notes, the claim to royal dignity that was foretold in prophecy of the Messiah. A wave of enthusiasm swept the hearts of the bystanders. The disciples strewed palm branches on His way. The multitudes and the children cried, 'Hosanna!'

It was not uncommon for pilgrims who had reached Jerusalem earlier to give a rousing welcome to friends on their arrival. For the festival had a touch of the excitement of an American convention with its troops of delegates from different states. By 'the multitude,' however, one should not imagine the general mass of the inhabitants of the city. Indeed one must guard against taking from the Gospel narratives the impression that the whole population of Palestine was excited about Jesus. As a matter of course He is the central figure in the Gospel stories, but that does not mean that wherever He went He secured universal attention. While a crowd in one street or one stretch of shore might be gathered eagerly round Him the rest of the city or countryside went on with its business. All London is not stirred though an orator may be holding spell-bound a packed crowd of thousands in Hyde Park or the Albert Hall. On this occasion, however, besides disciples there were hearers, admirers, people in some sense adherents of Jesus, forming a great crowd that was caught away in a sudden rush of emotion and joined the children and His friends in homage to Jesus.

Modern travellers who have gone over the road say that at one point, after traversing hollow ground the track from Bethany rounds a corner at the crest of the rise and discloses with startling suddenness a full view of the city of Jerusalem on the slopes ahead. This would seem to be the place where Jesus stopped and wept over its coming fate. He foresaw such destruction as war has brought to European cities in the present day falling upon the city and temple that looked so magnificent. The one chance of escape was if the Jews would turn from their smouldering hatred and fanatical nationalism to His way of peace. But how futile was this sudden flame of enthusiasm by the roadside! The great city remained unconcerned. So, though children cheered Him, Jesus wept.

A line of Rossetti's runs:

> The saddest words
> 'It might have been,' 'no more,' 'too late,' 'farewell.'

Many have felt it amiss to apply, even in a vague and hesitating way, the words 'it might have been' to anything concerning Jesus. They think that all He did, all that happened to Him, was an inevitable drama, planned beforehand and unalterable in any detail. Yet the story of His life is not drama but real history, and in history events are seen happening not inevitably, but as the result of the wills and emotions and opinions of the people concerned. When Jesus preached He was sincerely pleading with the men of His generation to change their minds, and thus to change the course of history. He was hoping against hope that they would listen, and He broke down in tears at the indifference of the city whose true King was at its gates. 'Thou knewest not the time of thy visitation.'

What would have happened had men known? Who can say? It seems profitless to enter upon any speculations. Yet who would deny that some great 'might-have-been' was behind the tears

which fell from Jesus while they strewed palm branches on the road.

The Gospel in Palestine. The gospel is thus seen here against a background of impending doom. Jesus had the certainty that the Jewish nation was heading for an abyss. He foresaw the utter devastation of the Holy City in which not one stone of the Temple would be left standing. 'Daughters of Jerusalem,' He said to the women who pitied Him as He bore His cross, 'weep not for me but for yourselves and for your children.' It was as definite a forecast of the devastation of war as any made in modern times by those who watched the growth of armaments. Jesus had this sense of impending doom, and He preached the gospel as a way of escape.

Far more, indeed, than has been generally understood in the Christian Church, Jesus, like the Old Testament prophets, had political vision and an urgent sense of the practical bearing of His message upon national policy and prospects. The situation in Palestine was one of increasing hatred and tension between the Roman administration and a Jewish people bitterly resentful of the heathen domination of their country. Ruthless repression did not stamp out underground movements. This state of affairs could not be expected to last indefinitely, and when the flare-up came the might of Rome would make disaster inevitable.

One element indeed in Jewish religion might, if it had been given a chance, have become a reconciling influence. The noblest teachers in Judaism had proclaimed that it was a missionary religion that would gather all nations into one spiritual allegiance. But so far from being a pacific factor in national policy and sentiment the religion of Judaism had turned away from that suggestion and become more and more fiercely national and narrowly patriotic cherishing hopes of a Messiah who would break heathen power and lead Jews to world conquest. Imbued with this spirit the nation was driving to destruction. Ruin came in forty years.

This was the situation in which Jesus preached; and without some hope of being effective, preaching cannot be sincere. Jesus preached with real hopefulness that hearers would be moved to listen and receive His message. When He pleaded with His people, He really meant that His gospel opened a way of escape from doom. His conviction was that true religion was the remedy for bad politics. His programme was for a pure and spiritual religion within which Jews and Romans might be friends, a religion of prayer rather than sacrifice, of brotherhood rather than nationality, of common faith in one Heavenly Father rather than pride in ritual or race. There was no reason then any more than now why such a religion should not diffuse itself like light and spread like a fire, and become everywhere a cleansing, sweetening, reconciling influence. In Jesus' day that was the one chance to change the course of history and avert a furious futile clash with Rome. But 'thou knewest not the time of thy visitation.'

The Gospel To-day. The gospel is, of course, a religious message of the way of escape from guilt and spiritual doom and of deliverance into eternal life. But this ultimate spiritual sense has to be integrated with its bearing on actual conduct. The preaching of the gospel always has a relation to human life and history. It always has a background of impending doom and an application to the politics of the day. For in every age politicians will not succeed in keeping the ship they try to steer off the rocks if religion is left out of account. Clever schemes will never make a prosperous community if hearts are without faith.

One does not need to reach back to ancient times for proof of this. The years before the war of 1914 were marked by other features as well as by the swift race in armaments. There was a large interest in social betterment. In the midst of growing wealth and material prosperity the Church had a fresh vision of the urgency of its missionary duty. If the high enthusiasm of Christian leaders had spread through the membership of the churches in Christian lands and become a driving force, history would have taken a very different course.

To-day over all the future hangs the menace of the general use of the atomic bomb which has put every scheme devised for security out of date and made the universal and catastrophic ruin of civilization a calculable probability. Of course there are plans for averting such disaster. But godless nations will bungle any plan and it does not seem as if many years may be available for mistakes or experiments. The fact that this new achievement of scientific genius causes more fear and foreboding than hope reinforces everything that has been said about the depravity of human nature and man's need of rescue from himself. Unless by divine grace men turn to God in repentance and obedience what real hope is there that the new energy will be used as it might be to raise the standard of living and not just to furnish a final and terrible chapter in the record of the sin and folly of mankind.

In Britain the success of any plans or policies in the difficult years ahead will demand in common people principles of unselfishness and idealism and brotherly love which nothing but the religion of Jesus Christ can nourish and sustain. In India the Christian missionary bears the message that Christ can bring unity and love instead of the discords and hatreds that hang as threatening clouds over its ancient civilization.

Will men not see that Jesus, who comes speaking of God and Father, and of human brotherhood, of forgiveness and self-sacrifice, is the rightful Lord of human life, to welcome and reverence and obey? Here is the real hope for the world. Will this generation know 'the time of its visitation'?

Recent Foreign Theology.

M. Ad. Lods is well known to Old Testament scholars everywhere, and particularly for his two great works 'Israel from its Beginnings to the Eighth Century,' and 'The Prophets of Israel,' which have appeared in English dress. During the war he has occupied himself largely with the publication of the *Bible du Centenaire*, for the Old Testament part of which he has been responsible. Unhappily this is not yet available in this country, but brief notes can be given on some other publications of his.

In 1940 he lectured to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres on **Some Accounts of Journeys to the Realm of the Dead,** and the lecture was subsequently published.[1] It reviews Jewish apocalyptical accounts of such journeys, beginning with Is 14, and continuing through the Ethiopic and Slavonic books of Enoch and other pseudepigraphical works to the end of the first century A.D., with special attention to the varying number of heavens which appear in the various works.

In 1943 he again lectured to the Académie on **some aspects of Hebrew belief on what follows death,** this time dealing with the death of the uncircumcised, to which reference is made in the book of Ezekiel (28^{10}), and the victory over Leviathan.[2] In the former of these he argues that amongst people who practised circumcision there were some who neglected to do so, and for these the status of an outcast would be reserved in the next world. He conjectures that the Hebrew practice of circumcising on the eighth day after birth may have owed something to the desire to guard against this fate, and so finds some parallel with the history of baptism. But the second part of this lecture is the more interesting. In it he considers the texts referring to Leviathan in the Old Testament and in the Ras Shamra finds, and endeavours to elucidate the former in the light of the latter. He holds that in Is $26^{20f.}$ 27^{1} we have a single figure referred to, and not three as is frequently supposed, and that this figure is comparable to Cerberus, set to guard against any escape from Sheol, so that when he is slain the way of escape, and therefore of resurrection, is open.

Another paper from Professor Lods's pen appeared in 1944, dealing with **the Kitchens of the Jerusalem Temple.**[3] Beginning from the problems attaching to Ezk $42^{13f.}$ $46^{19ff.}$, he studies the Old Testament evidence for the existence of kitchens within the Temple, for the provision of meals for the laity and for the priests, and goes on to study the evidence from Babylonia, Egypt, and other ancient lands, for similar provision at their shrines, He believes that the memory of the sacrificial repasts of antiquity has contributed to the persistence and popularity of the repast partaken at the cultic places in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.

A melancholy interest attaches to the annual **review of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres,** which Professor Lods presented in November 1944.[4] He was then the Vice-President of the Academy, but upon him fell the duty of presenting it as the President, M. Henri Maspero, the sinologue, had been carried off to Germany, together with his wife, some months earlier, to be punished by the Germans for offences alleged to have been committed by members of their family. In noble words Professor Lods protested against this reversion to barbarism, and observed that the Israelites who were so decried by the Nazis, had risen to a higher level of civilization centuries before the Christian era, in the law of Dt 24^{16}. Professor Lods had also to record that M. Paul Collomp, of the University of Strasbourg, evacuated to Clermont-Ferrand at the outbreak of war, had been murdered in cold blood by the Germans. It may be added that M. Maspero died in the hands of his captors, and that another distinguished French scholar, M. L. Delaporte, died in Buchenwald. And so mounts the weary tale of what Professor Lods calls 'the processes of justice systematically employed by the people who professed to teach the rest of the world the rational and equitable principles that should henceforth preside over their organization.' It is more pleasant to note that the Academy continued its meetings throughout the war period, and even during the fateful 1944 it met every week, with a single exception in August, to testify by its calm devotion to scientific study the unconquerability of its spirit. M. Lods claims that that was a real, though modest, element in French resistance.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester.

[1] *De quelques récits de voyage au pays des morts.* Protat, Macon (for the Institut de France). (1940.)

[2] 'Note sur deux croyances hébraïques relatives à la mort et à ce qui la suit : le sort des incirconcis dans l'au-delà et la victoire sur Léviatan,' offprinted from *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* (1943), pp. 271–297.

[3] 'Les cuisines du temple de Jérusalem,' offprinted from *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, cxxvii (1944), pp. 30–54.

[4] *Discours de M. Adolphe Lods.* Institut de France, Paris. (1944.)

The New Order.

XVIII. The Church, Catholic and Evangelical.

By the Reverend John Gray, B.D., Chaplain, R.N.

The main function of the Christian Church is to extend herself—to extend, that is, the Kingdom or the reign of Christ. In the performance of this function she has throughout her history used two main strategies which may be called—the Catholic (to be distinguished, of course, from the Roman) and the Evangelical.

Despite a constant change of emphasis in the use of the one strategy or the other, neither has ever been completely neglected. The Catholic strategy was notably used in the conversion of the Roman Empire under Constantine and in the mediæval idea of the Christian Republic, but fundamentally the same conception was in the minds of John Cotton, William Penn and Roger Williams in seventeenth-century America. The idea which fired the imagination of Hildebrand and the mediæval Popes was the same as that of the Pilgrim Fathers—the idea of a theocracy, of a rule of God on earth enforced by human laws. Their strategy was aimed at the community as a whole.

The Evangelical strategy was used by St. Francis and Savonarola as well as by Wiclif and Wesley. It was aimed of course at the individual. There is room for both strategies in the Church and there is need of both in the post-war world.

Chaplains in the Armed Forces have found how easily the two strategies can be combined and how effectively they can be used. The chaplain of a ship, a battalion, or an R.A.F. Station is well placed as regards making an impact on the whole community. He has ready and frequent access to the ruler of the community—the Commanding Officer. He is almost automatically on every Committee concerned with the welfare of the unit as a whole. He is intimately connected with, if not directly responsible for, education, entertainment, sport, and family welfare; and he is frequently the mouthpiece of complaints and suggestions with regard to food, housing, mail, pay, and conditions of service.

He is equally well placed as regards the individuals who make up the community. He has a limited number in his parish—nearly always under two thousand. They are so concentrated that it is perfectly possible for him to make effective contact with each one. He can indeed see most of them almost daily, and can spend long hours in conversation with them.

He is thus able to use both strategies—the Catholic and the Evangelical. Most chaplains have consequently found a satisfaction in their work greater than they ever found in peace-time, and in most cases they have had results far better than they had conceived possible.

With what situation are these chaplains to be met when they return to their civil parishes? In Churches in the new housing areas they will find conditions almost as favourable as those they have become used to in the Services, with the additional advantages of a greater homogeneity and a greater stability in their flock. They will also naturally be faced with a true community of homes as opposed to the artificial community of the Services. This will more than offset the disadvantage that, apart from industrial chaplaincies, they will have little contact with their people at work. For the man in an extension charge in one of the new areas both the Catholic and Evangelical approach are possible, and the hard work involved in their use will yield a rich dividend.

In rural one-Church parishes, similar conditions prevail, apart from the wider physical area involved. Where two or more Churches have grown up in a parish able to be covered by one, firm action by the Church must be looked for. It may be hoped that this will meet with a wide and unselfish vision of the needs of the whole Church on the part of the members concerned. Generally, however, even at the moment, the minister of a rural parish has fairly effective contact with each individual in his parish, as well as having the opportunity of influencing the life of the whole community. The same is true of villages and small towns.

In large towns with a population of seven to seventy thousand the returning chaplain will find that his individual contacts are sufficiently satisfactory, but he will probably feel frustrated by the absence of any effective contact with the community as a whole. The Catholic approach will be impossible for him as an individual. His oversight of the town he will share with anything from three to thirty other ministers of the Established Church, not to mention those of the other Protestant denominations. He cannot alone, therefore, enter into any real relationship with the town as such. One suggestion may be made

which, if adopted, would help to solve the difficulty. It is that in each such town a Council should be formed composed of representatives of each congregation, a minister, a layman, a woman, and a youth representative. Such a Council, which might be called 'The Parish Council,' could view the town as a community whole and could enter into relationships with the School Management Committee, by an Education Committee; with booksellers and libraries, by a Publications Committee; with the Town Council by a Public Relations Committee; with the Licensing Court; with the Registrar of Marriages; with other Churches, industrial concerns, and so on. Its function would be nothing less than the evangelization of the town. In such a Town or Parish Council the varying gifts, experience, and influence of ministers and lay-folk alike could be utilized in an attack on the community. Thus would be utilized the two strategies open to the Church in her work.

In the cities the situation will utterly depress the returning chaplain. He will, if his congregation is of any size, find both the Catholic and the Evangelical approach impossible. His members will be scattered not only over the whole city, but probably into the contiguous counties. He will find most of his time is spent in travelling in the vain and useless endeavour to keep people 'in touch' with his Church who should long ago have become regularly attending members of churches on their doorsteps. To cure this situation, a much more vigorous policy of transference of members must be pursued. People should be made aware that it is the desire of the whole Church that they should transfer their membership if they move outwith a radius of say, five miles of their former congregation. If a large number took the hint, this would make the Evangelical approach possible, and permit men to concentrate on their real job of being parish ministers instead of wasting their time, cash, and energies on travelling. The Catholic approach to the city is never easy. It is doubtful to what extent a city of the size of London or Glasgow can ever be a real community. In so far as it is, the Bishop or the Presbytery probably makes an impression as great as any that can be made. Parish Councils might, with good effect, however, be set up in the cities, the areas covered corresponding either to the Parliamentary constituencies or to the Registration areas. The greatest step however that could be taken to ease the present situation in the cities and to make the ministers' work less frustrating, would be to initiate a great drive for the transference of members and not only of those members whose loyalty is in doubt. The charges in the new suburbs need the strength given by members whose love of the Church is beyond question, and the Christian witness of the members is much more effective if their membership is in a Church vitally concerned with the community in which they live.

Almost half of the Service men and women will, on demobilization, return to one or other of the cities. Beyond any question, they are hungry for the gospel, eager to take their place in communities in which the Church's witness is clear and strong. If they are to have the personal interest taken in them which they need and desire, some such steps as those outlined above will have to be taken. Churches which resemble religious clubs will have no appeal for them. Loyal members must insist that their Church should not be run for their own benefit; must insist that the efforts of minister and office-bearers should be directed at those outside or on the fringe of membership. Nay, more, they must themselves be eager to accept responsibility not only for Christian witness in the community, but also for pastoral care of the unevangelized.

The harvest truly is plenteous, and the reapers sufficient in number, if only they can be set to work. Set to work they must. The task of the Church in our day is too vast and too pressing to be overtaken by the ministry, however reorganized. It demands the dedication and self-sacrifice of all who know and love Him who is the Church's Head and King.

The Interpretation of the Old Testament.

By the Reverend James Wood, M.A., Aberdeen.

There is a revival of interest in the theological interpretation of Scripture. In one of the most recent works on the subject, *The Interpretation of the Bible*, edited by C. W. Dugmore, the editor in his preface, p. vii, says, 'The interpretation of the Bible is a fundamental issue in the religious situation to-day. How are we to teach it?'

It is significant, too, that in the last few years a number of volumes has been published, all dealing with the Bible, more from the theological, than from the literary or historical point of view Among these, probably the best known are, *The Throne of David* by A. G. Hebert, *The Relevance of the Bible* by H. H. Rowley, and *Preface to Bible*

Study by A. Richardson. These works at least, do show that there is a growing awareness that in order properly to understand the Bible, something more than literary analysis and historical background is needed.

However, it is surely worthy of more than passing reference to observe that in the attempts to point the way to a fuller understanding of the Bible a serious claim is being made on behalf of the Mystical Interpretation of Scripture. In the volume edited by Dugmore there is an essay written by Conrad Pepler, O.P., entitled 'The Faith of the Middle Ages.' In it, the author presents rather a persuasive case on behalf of the Allegorical Interpretation of Scripture. Also, in Hebert's work, a strong claim is put forward on behalf of the Mystical Interpretation of Scripture. Then, in the same line of thought there is an article in *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, by Darwell Stone, entitled 'The Mystical Interpretation of the Old Testament.'

Now, whatever may be one's reaction to any attempt to resuscitate either the allegorical or mystical methods of interpretation, it ought to be realized that the protagonists thereof are seriously concerned to make a positive contribution towards the interpretation of the Old Testament. Darwell Stone permits himself the opinion (which is quoted with approval by Hebert), 'the Church is not likely to be able to retain the reading of the Old Testament and the recitation of the Psalter in public worship unless the use of the mystical interpretation is to some extent recognized' (*op. cit.*, 695). Hebert attributes 'our modern alienation from the Old Testament' to 'the loss of the old mystical interpretation' (*op. cit.*, 33). Pepler says *à propos* the allegorizing method, 'If we allow for certain exaggerations . . . we can come to a sympathetic understanding of this method of interpretation' (*op. cit.*, 36).

But on closer examination of the works just quoted, certain forebodings arise in one's mind. For right on the threshold of our inquiry we find that the writers themselves seem to be conscious of some serious limitations in the methods they advocate. Although Darwell Stone has argued his case for the mystical interpretation, yet he cannot allow himself to say anything more definite than that it ought to be '*to some extent* recognized' (italics ours). But clearly, one must ask, just how much is included in this 'to some extent'? Is this really a roundabout way of coming to the conclusion that there is something in it?

A similar hesitancy about the mystical method is manifested by Charles Harris, who writes the 'Appended Note' to the article written by Darwell Stone. Harris says, 'All this method of mystical interpretation whether Hellenic, Jewish, or Christian is alien and repellent to the modern mind. But it requires more consideration than it has recently received.' He concludes his note thus, 'All these considerations seem to point to the need for a fresh treatment of mystical interpretation which shall distinguish between its arbitrary and its rational use.'

The work of Hebert is a bold attempt to save the mystical interpretation from its subjective and arbitrary weaknesses. Although he retains the phrase 'Mystical Interpretation,' yet what he proposes in general might more accurately be described as an 'Enlightened Typology.' He draws out clearly the mutual relations between certain ideas and institutions in the Old Testament, and their counterparts in the New Testament, as these have been fulfilled in Jesus Christ. Further, he seeks to find 'objectivity' for his principle of interpretation by demonstrating that it has a 'theological character' (*op. cit.*, 259).

Despite all that may rightly be said in favour of Hebert's main thesis, one feels that his work is at its least satisfactory level just at this point. For his mystical principle in itself offers no real guidance as to how we are to determine 'theological character' in any interpretation. Whose or what theology is to be paramount? Secondly, Hebert has not realized sufficiently that the history of mystical interpretation is itself a very grim warning against its revival to-day. The fact seems to be (cf. Farrar, *History of Interpretation*, Lecture III) that this type of interpretation cannot, in the long run, keep itself free from the dangers of subjectivism.

If what has been said in criticism of the mystical interpretation has any cogency, it will not be necessary to deal in detail with the allegorical method, advocated by Conrad Pepler. The allegorical method may still appeal to some, largely on psychological grounds, or even on æsthetic grounds (cf. *E.R.E.* xii. 503). But it still remains true that this method has been tried and found wanting. The method is inadequate because of an inherent weakness within the principle itself. It tends to drift away from the literal and historical meaning of Scripture. It is possible, that with proper safeguards, allegorical and mystical interpretations may have a part to play. But even so, this can hardly be anything more than a methodological device. Also, the area wherein it might possibly be applied would tend to be small. The fact is that such types of approach to the Old Testament have not sufficient contact with reality within them, to stand up to the strain and stress of interpreting such a living thing as the Old Testament. It is the Old Testament itself which finally condemns the allegorical and mystical interpretations.

If the Old Testament is to be interpreted to our age, then all the resources of critical scholarship will be required. Despite the defects of the modern approach, it must not be forgotten that the remedy is not to soft-pedal the critical method, but by the patient reapplication of the method to put the defects right. Thus it is not surprising that in these days, scholars who are faithful to the critical approach are leaders among those who are seeking to a view of the Old Testament which will do justice to it as Christian Scripture. It seems to us that if this end is to be attained, then three things must be borne in mind.

(*a*) There is need to re-examine the presuppositions wherewith we approach the Old Testament.[1] In other words, proper regard must be had to the fact of the Bible being a religious book. We have to ask, what is the Bible about? What is its place in the Divine Revelation? Merely to regard the Bible as a collection of ancient documents is to refuse the witness of the Bible to itself. Some attempts must be made to state what *kind* of book the Bible is. (*b*) The connexion between the Old Testament and Exegesis must not be ignored. Critical study cannot be content to become an end in itself. Sooner or later, all roads lead to Jesus Christ. For all practical purposes the question becomes, Is the Old Testament best understood in the light of the (Jewish) Law or in the light of Jesus Christ? Is the Old Testament a Jewish book or is it Christian Scripture? Only when it is clearly recognized that Jesus Christ Himself is its Interpreter, is the Old Testament properly understood. (*c*) There is no one simple, final solution of the problem of the interpretation of the Old Testament. In the nature of the case, it is inevitable that there will be a certain amount of tension between the Old Testament and the New Testament. Along with their affinities there are real differences. Hence there will always be a need for all the insights of the ripest scholarship possible. Each age will take up the task where its predecessor left off. But in every age the solution will be found, not in the application to the Old Testament of some principle or technique of interpretation, applied *in order to* make the Old Testament consonant with the New Testament. Anything which suggests 'juggling' with the Old Testament must be avoided. Rather, what is to be essayed is to relate *both* the Old Testament and the New Testament to Him who is the source and criterion of all revelation, and who alone is the Lord of Scripture.

[1] Dr. T. W. Manson, in an essay contributed to *The Interpretation of the Bible*, writes, 'the mischief was begun when the working hypotheses of natural science were allowed to become the dogmas of theology' (p. 101).

Entre Nous.

The Letters of Annie S. Swan.

In however simple or humble a way, Annie Swan spoke from a pulpit. She is one of the minor prophets of Scotland. The medium she chose was homespun and plain, like herself. (I use the word plain in the noble Scots sense of those who measure out rich praise when they say 'he was a fine plain body.') It was so plain and homespun that only a complete sincerity, coupled with the mysterious and enviable power of telling a story, got her into print at all. Her *Letters* (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net), show us how seriously she took her remarkable gift, and how she recognized that such a gift demands the loyalty of a lifetime austerly and rigorously planned.

Her pulpit was by no means confined to her books. The same quality of magic which spreads a glamour (yet not a poetic glamour) over all her stories, illuminated her public speaking. She unrolled platitude after platitude, dull, sensible, trite, but as she herself knew, there was a quality in her words and in her voice, of emotion and sincerity, of simplicity and of some other untabulated vitamin, which made it oratory. 'As I spoke,' she writes in 1918, 'fear went from me and only the message remained. I knew it was getting home by the tenseness of the atmosphere. It is an extraordinary power to be able to hold an audience in the hollow of one's hand, to be able to play upon it as on a harp of ten strings. No one knows whence it comes, but undoubtedly it is a power to be guarded against, otherwise it can be very dangerous. . . . I can only describe the effect of that morning's work as magical.'

The famous Mr. Heinz wrote to her at the same time: 'You have a magnetic influence over everyone who hears you.'

Is this magnetic strain, allied to great intellectual power, that which produces genius? In Annie Swan the powerful intellect was absent. Religious devotion, sweetness of disposition, moral intensity, a romantic love for her native land and for her fellow-men, yes, these were richly present. And so she writes: 'the making of a book cannot be explained. It makes itself in some strange way and I suppose that is why it must be sometimes, as in this case, a thing of shreads and patches

expressing the varying moods of its creator. Quite often I am amazed at the motley of my thoughts which carry me up and down in breathless haste.' And she adds, 'the reviews so far have been quite good.'

Perhaps it was exactly the absence of that strange and terrifying alien to all things sweet and domestic which we call genius that endeared her so deeply to the simple and homely and wise.

Her motto was 'Believe in God and in humanity, live a pure life and very simple, work hard and love much.' And it was she who sent the lines which are written on Winifred Holtby's grave:

God give me work
Till my life shall end
And life
Till my work is done.

This collection of her letters is most ably and charmingly edited by Mildred Robertson Nicoll, who has had the wisdom to include a number of interesting letters to her authoress. Those from Mr. St. John Irvine are notably interesting.

EDITH ANNE ROBERTSON.

Life beyond the Grave.

'But when we ask what Jesus has told us about the conditions of life beyond the grave we have to acknowledge something of a sense of disappointment that He has revealed so little, He who could alone speak with authority on this matter. The characteristic features of Christ's treatment of this subject are unwavering and sublime assurance of the fact of a future life, combined with great reserve as to its nature and precise conditions. Here as in other aspects of His teaching Jesus seemed to be content to give but great guiding principles, leaving His followers to enter into the apprehension of fuller and more detailed truth through a growing appreciation and experimental understanding of the meaning of His revelation under the guidance of His ever present Spirit. God is our Heavenly Father all-wise and all-powerful and all-loving, who in His love and power and wisdom has called men into saving fellowship with Himself; all else for this life and the next must follow from this. And here as elsewhere we have ever to remember that the object of Divine revelation is strictly practical, given not to gratify our intellectual curiosity but to show us the path in which we may walk now with a sure and certain hope. So that on this matter as on others just so much has been revealed as is sufficient for our guidance in the present, sufficient to encourage and support faith and to enable us to tread across the distances with quiet and trustful confidence in a Heavenly Father's leading and provision.' [1]

'And I Work.'

'We must substitute a more dynamic and progressive for a static conception of the future life. A paradise of inaction, a condition of stagnant bliss without progress or development, this would be to the human spirit an intolerable burden. In this life man's highest happiness lies in the worthy unimpeded exercise of his intellectual and artistic and moral and spiritual energies. And surely the life of the future will not be a mere contrast to the best life of earth. Rather will it be, we may well expect, a heightening and transfiguring of the life of the present, a life in which man's whole nature springs into a new vividness of activity, and the energies and powers of this life, set free from the hampering restrictions and limitations of the body of flesh and blood and provided with what Paul calls a "spiritual" body, *i.e.* a body which shall be the fit organ and instrument of the spirit under more spiritual conditions, shall win greater heights of achievement than were possible to us here. "My Father worketh even now," said Jesus, "and I work" (Jn 5^{17}). And if God and Christ are for ever working, it would seem that those who would increasingly resemble them in spirit and in character must participate in the same life of work and activity.' [2]

[1] J. M. Shaw, *Life after Death*, 28.

Small Movements.

In Miss Gordon Holmes' autobiography called *In Love with Life* that highly successful financier writes:

'I am always struck by the influence, power, and force of small movements. Somebody starts something, gets a small meeting together, and years hence people who never heard of that little beginning are moving to the measure of that thought.

'If you have an idea, a cause, something that seems to you worth while, perhaps worth your heart's blood, don't be afraid to start it because its initial impulse must be so tiny. If it is worth while you will get help.'

Avarice and his Colleagues.

Dr. W. R. Inge wrote recently in *The Evening Standard*: 'There will be no more rich people in England, except perhaps a few popular entertainers and salaried managers of large businesses. We see the results already. Our young people—I speak of those in my own walk of life—no longer think much about money. They marry cheerfully without "settlements," in a bungalow and a baby Austin. Other babies follow; they do not want childless marriages.'

One of the deadly sins, Avarice, has had his wings clipped. The worshippers of the golden calf have deserted their idol. But he has colleagues who may be lying in wait for us.

[2] J. M. Shaw, *Life after Death*, 53.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.